



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 42]
No. 42]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अश्विन 15, 1977/ आश्विन 23, 1899
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1977/ASVINA 23, 1899

इस भाग में निम्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

**Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities**

उपराष्ट्रपति सचिवालय

VICE-PRESIDENT'S SECRETARIAT

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 1977

New Delhi, the 12th September, 1977

का०आ० 3113.—भारत के उपराष्ट्रपति, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, चंडीगढ़ के कुलाधिपति की हैसियत से पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए प्रो० हरकिशन सिंह, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, चंडीगढ़ के मुख्य प्राचार्य फार्मस्युटिकल साइन्स विभाग, का पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय के सीनेट के साधारण पार्षद के पद से त्याग पत्र स्वीकार करते हैं।

अधिम, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय अधिनियम 13 की उपधारा (1) (जे) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए कुलाधिपति जी पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय के भूतपूर्व कुलपति श्री सूरजभान को श्री हरकिशन सिंह के पद त्याग के कारण हुए रिक्त स्थान पर साधारण पार्षद मनोनीत करते हैं।

[सं० बी० पी० एम०/पी०यू०/77]

वि० फडके, भारत के उपराष्ट्रपति एवं
पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, चंडीगढ़ के भविष्य

S.O. 3113.—The Vice-President of India, in his capacity as the Chancellor of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, has in exercise of his powers under Sub-Section (1) of Section 17, of the Panjab University Act has accepted the resignation of Professor Harkishan Singh, Head of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh from Ordinary Fellowship of the Senate of the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Further in exercise of his powers under Sub-Section (1) (j) of Section 13 of the Panjab University Act, Chancellor is pleased to nominate Shri Suraj Bhan, former Vice-Chancellor of the Panjab University, as an Ordinary Fellow to the Senate of the Panjab University in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Professor Harkishan Singh.

[No. VPS/PU/77]

V. PHADKE, Secy.

to the Vice-President of India & the Chancellor,
Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(3665)

बिधि, न्याय तथा कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(न्याय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 1977

नोटिस

कां.आं. 3114.—इसके द्वारा, लेख्य प्रमाणक नियम (नोटरीज रूल्स), 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसार, सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्राधिकारी को बी० डी० परिहार, एडवोकेट, सरस्वती सदन, रेसवे स्टेशन रोड, जोधपुर ने उक्त नियमों के नियम 4 के अधीन, जोधपुर में लेख्य प्रमाणक (नोटरी) का काम करने की नियुक्ति के लिए आवेदन पत्र भेजा है।

उक्त व्यक्ति की लेख्य प्रमाणक के रूप में नियुक्ति के बारे में यदि कोई आपत्तियां हों तो वे इस नोटिस के प्रकाशित होने के चौदह दिन के अन्दर नीचे हस्ताक्षर करने वाले को लिख कर भेज दिये जाएंगे।

[सं० 22/52/77-न्याय]

आर० वामुदेवन, सक्षम अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Justice)

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1977

NOTICE

S.O. 3114.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri B. D. Parihar, Advocate, Saraswati Sadan, Railway Station Road, Jodhpur for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jodhpur.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. 22/52/77-Justice]

R. VASUDEVAN, Under Secy.

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 1977

कां.आं. 813(ई) 3115.—जांच आयोग अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 60) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के, गृह मंत्रालय की तारीख 30 मई, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० कां.आं. 375 (अ) में, जो मारुति समुत्थानों से संबंधित है, निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, पैरा 2 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित पैरा अंतःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“2क. पैरा 2 में ऐसा कोई विषय सम्मिलित नहीं समझा जाएगा जो भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय (कामिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग) की तारीख 14 जून, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० कां.आं. 393 (अ०) (श्री बंसी लाल से संबंधित) के अनुलग्नक में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्देश-निबन्धनों की निम्नलिखित मदों में सम्मिलित है; अर्थात् :—

(क) मद संख्या 1;

(ख) मद संख्या 2; और

(ग) मद संख्या 7, जहाँ तक इसका संबंध बम बोजियों के निर्माण का कार्य सैसर्स मारुति लिमिटेड को सौंपे जाने से संबंधित आवेदनों के जारी होने से है”।

[सं० एफ-2/16011/32/77-एम एण्ड पी (डी-2)]

टिप्पणी :- इस अधिसूचना का अंग्रेजी अनुबाव भारत राजपत्र (असाधारण) दिनांक 11 अगस्त, 1977 के अंक में कां.आं. 613 (ई) के अन्तर्गत छप चुका है।

कां.आं. 814(ई) 3116.—जांच आयोग अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 60) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय की तारीख 28 मई, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० कां.आं. 374 (अ) में (जिसका संबंध 25 जून, 1975 को उद्घोषित आपात स्थिति के दौरान की गई व्यावस्थियों से है) निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, पैरा 2 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित पैरा अंतःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“2क. पैरा 2 में ऐसा कोई विषय सम्मिलित नहीं समझा जाएगा जो—

(क) निम्नलिखित अधिसूचनाओं में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्देश-निबन्धनों में सम्मिलित है, अर्थात् :—

(i) भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय की तारीख 30 मई, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० कां.आं. 375 (अ) (जो मारुति समुत्थानों से संबंधित है); अथवा

(ii) भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय (कामिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग) की तारीख 14 जून, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० कां.आं. 393 (अ) (जो श्री बंसीलाल से संबंधित है); अथवा

(ख) भारत सरकार के, गृह मंत्रालय (कामिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग) की तारीख 19 मई, 1977 की अधि सूचना सं० कां.आं. 360 (अ) में (जो आन्ध्र प्रदेश के मुख्यमंत्री और उसकी सचिवालय के कुछ सदस्यों के विरुद्ध लगाए गए आरोपों से संबंधित है) विनिर्दिष्ट निर्देश निबन्धनों में तारीख 6 अप्रैल, 1977 के जापन में विहित आरोपों में से आरोप संख्यांक 21 से संबंधित कोई विषय।”

[सं० एफ-2/16011/32/77-एम एण्ड पी (डी-2)]

टिप्पणी :- इस अधिसूचना का अंग्रेजी अनुबाव भारत राजपत्र (असाधारण) दिनांक 11 अगस्त, 1977 के अंक में कां.आं. 614 (ई) के अन्तर्गत छप चुका है।

महेश्वर प्रसाद, अपर सचिव

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

कां.आं. 3117.—आन्ध्र प्रदेश प्रशासनिक अधिकरण आवेश, 1975 (सां.कां.निं. 285 ई, तारीख 19 मई, 1975) के पैरा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति, श्री गोविन्द नारायण के त्यागपत्र देने के कारण खाली हुए स्थान पर भारत सरकार, रक्षा मंत्रालय के पूर्व संयुक्त सचिव, श्री राजेन्द्र लाल को, उसके द्वारा अपने पद का कार्य संभालने की तारीख से आन्ध्र प्रदेश प्रशासनिक अधिकरण का सदस्य नियुक्त करते हैं।

[सं० एस-21011/9/77 एस० आर०]

आर० एल० मिश्र, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

S.O. 3117.—In exercise of the powers conferred by paragraph 3 of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal Order, 1975 (GSR 285E, dated 19th May, 1975), the President is pleased to appoint Shri Rajendra Lal, formerly Joint Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Government of India, as Member of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal with effect from the date he takes over charge of office, in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Govind Narain.

[No. S-21011/9/77-SR]

R. L. MISRA, Jt. Secy.

सक्षम प्राधिकारी का कार्यालय

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

नोटिस

कां.आं. 3118.—इसके द्वारा लेख्य प्रमाणक नियम (नोटरीज रूल्स), 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसार, सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा सूचना दी जाती

है कि उक्त प्राधिकारी को श्री जी०एल० गोस्वामी, एडवोकेट 83 तीस हजारी कोर्ट, देहली ने उक्त नियमों के नियम 4 के अधीन, देहली में लेख्य प्रमाणक (नोटरी) का काम करने की नियुक्ति के लिये आवेदन पत्र भेजा है।

उक्त व्यक्ति की लेख्य प्रमाणक के रूप में नियुक्ति के बारे में यदि कोई आपत्तियां हो तो इस नोटिस के प्रकाशित होने के चौदह दिन के अन्दर नीचे हस्ताक्षर करने वाले को लिख कर भेज दिये जायें।

[सं० 22/38/77 न्याय]

आर० वामुदेवन, मक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

NOTICE

S.O. 3118.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rule, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri G. L. Goswami, Advocate, 83, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi for appointment as a Notary to practise in Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said persons as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 22/38/77-Jus.]

R. VASUDEVAN, Competent Authority.

वित्त मंत्रालय

आयकर एवं संपत्तिकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, जयपुर एवं जोधपुर

जयपुर, 12 अगस्त, 1977

आदेश

क्रा० आ० 3119.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43वा) की धारा 287 की उपधारा (1) के तहत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सौंपी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड राजस्व एवं बीमा विभाग, वित्त मंत्रालय भारत सरकार नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रदत्त प्राधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं अधोहस्ताक्षर कर्ता, एन० द्वारा जिन लोगों के मामलों में वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 में एक लाख से ज्यादा की बकाया मांग अप्रलेखित (बट्टे खाते वाली गई) की गई और जिनके नाम जनहित में प्रकाशित करने आवश्यक समझे गये हैं, के नामों को प्रकाशित करना हूँ। (विवरण परिशिष्ट में दिये अनुसार है)।

परिशिष्ट

कैटिगरी 'डी'

वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान जिन व्यक्तियों की एक लाख या इससे ऊपर की बकाया मांग अप्रलेखित की गई उनकी सूची

क्रम सं०	निर्धारित का नाम और पता	व्यक्ति	निर्धारण वर्ष	अप्रलेखित की गई राशि	अप्रलेखन के संक्षिप्त कारण
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	श्रीयुक्त हीरापाल मासीराम, भीलवाड़ा	अवि० हि० परिवार	1956-57	1,31,310	1976-77 के अपने आदेश संख्या 6 दिनांक 16-3-77 द्वारा आयुक्त द्वारा अप्रलेखित की गई।
2.	श्री नसीरुद्दीन पुत्र नाथू जी बड़ी छाट, नागौर	व्यक्ति	1958-59 से 1972-73	1,21,928	स्थानीय पृष्ठताछ से पता चला है कि बूककर्ता (डिफास्टर) की आधिक स्थिति बहुत खराब है और वह अपने जीवन के अंतिम दिन व्यतीत कर रहा है क्योंकि वह 69 वर्ष का हो चुका है। वह पिछले 5 साल से टी० बी० का मरीज है और अपने लड़कों तथा अन्य रिश्तेदारों पर निर्भर है। उनकी आमदनी का कोई जरिया नहीं है और किसी तरह का धंधा करने की क्षमता नहीं है। रिपोर्ट के अनुसार उसके पास कोई फंड नहीं है और विशाल बकाया राशि देने के लिये कोई अचल आस्ति भी नहीं है। कर वसूली अधिकारी ने भी वसूली योग्य नहीं होने का प्रमाण पत्र दे दिया है। इसके बाद जोनल कमेटी ने मांग के 121928 रुपये के आधिक अप्रलेखन का आदेश दिया है और बची हुई 20,000 रुपये की मांग भविष्य में वसूल करने के लिये जीवित रखी गई है।
3.	श्री घडी प्रसाद खेतान, सीकर	व्यक्ति	1947-48	2,47,433	निर्धारित की आय का कोई साधन नहीं है न कोई आस्ति ही उपलब्ध है।
4.	मैसर्स इस्टर्न (कॉमोडीटीज) प्रा० लिमिटेड प्रा० कम्पनी कंपनी खेतान भवन, जयपुर।		1963-64 से 1965-66	3,45,459	निर्धारित कंपनी एवं उसके डाइरेक्टर के ठौर ठिकाने सामुम नहीं हैं।
5.	मैसर्स श्री विजय काटन मिल्स लि०, विजयनगर	प्रा० लिमिटेड कंपनी	1965-66 एवं 1966-67 एवं 1943-44	5,25,000	मांग वसूल नहीं की जा सकती क्योंकि कंपनी का परिचयपत्र हो रहा है।

[सं० न्या०/प० 287/आई०टी०/77-78/656]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Office of the Commissioner of Income-tax and Wealth Tax,
Jaipur & Jodhpur)

ORDER

Jaipur, the 12th August, 1977

S.O. 3119.—In exercise of the power delegated by the Central Government under sub-section (1) of section 287 of the

Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and under the authority given by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue and Insurance, Government of India, New Delhi, I, the undersigned hereby publish the names & other particulars of the persons in whose cases demands written off exceeded Rs. 1 lakh during the financial year 1976-77, publication of which has been considered necessary in the public interest (particulars as per annexure).

ANNEXURE

CATEGORY 'D'

List of persons whom demand write off exceeding Rupees one Lakh & above during the F.Y. 1976-77.

S.No.	Name & Address of the assessee	Status	Asstt. Year	Amount written off	Brief reasons for write off
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	M/s Hiralal Mallram Bhilwara	HUF	1956-57	1,31,310	Written off by C.I.T. vide order No. 6 of 76-77 dt. 16-3-77.
2.	Shri Nasiruddin S/o Nathuji Badl Khatu, Distt. Nagaur	Individual	1958-59 to 1972-73	1,21,928	Local enquiries conducted revealed that the defaulter's financial position is very bad and he is merely passing his last days of his life as he is 69 years of age. He has been suffering from T.B. for the last 5 years and is dependent upon his sons and other relatives. He has no source of income nor he has any capacity to carry on any business. As per reports, he has no funds nor any immovable assets to pay the huge arrear demand. The TRO has also issued the irrecoverability certificate. Therefore, the Zonal Committee has ordered for partial write off of the demand to the extent of Rs. 1,21,928 and the rest of the demand of Rs. 20,000 has been kept alive for future recoveries.
3.	Shri Chandi Pd. Khetan, Sikar.	Ind.	1947-48	2,47,433	Assessee has no source of income nor there was any asset available.
4.	M/s Eastern Commodities (P) Ltd. Co. Khetan Bhawan, Jaipur.	P. Co.	1963-64 to 1965-66	3,35,459	The whereabouts of the assessee company and its Director were not traceable.
5.	M/s Shri Bijay Cotton Mills Ltd., Bijaynagar.	P Ltd. Co.	1965-66 & 1966-67 & 1943 to 46	5,25,000	Demand irrecoverable because the company is under liquidation.

[No. J/Pub. 287/IT/77-78/656]

घादेश

जयपुर, 26 सितम्बर, 1977

परिशिष्ट

क्रा० अा० 3120.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43वां) की धारा 287 की उपधारा (1) के तहत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सौंपी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड राजस्व एवं बीमा विभाग, वित्त मंत्रालय भारत सरकार नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रवृत्त प्राधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं अधोहस्ताक्षरी, एतद्वारा उन कर दाताओं के नाम एवं अन्य विवरण प्रकाशित करता हूँ जिनकी वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान कुल आय 2 लाख या इससे अधिक (व्यक्ति एवं अधिभाजित हिन्दू परिवारों के मामलों में) और 10 लाख या इससे अधिक (फर्मों, व्यक्तियों के संगमों या कंपनियों के मामलों में) निर्धारित की गई और जिनका प्रकाशन जनहित में आवश्यक समझा गया है। (परिशिष्ट के अनुसार)।

उन समस्त व्यक्तियों एवं अधिभाजित हिन्दू परिवारों के नाम जिनकी वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 की कुल आय 2 लाख या उससे ऊपर निर्धारित की गई है एवं उन फर्मों, व्यक्तियों के संगमों एवं कंपनियों के नाम जिनकी कुल आय वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 में 10 लाख से ऊपर निर्धारित की गई है।

- (1) (i) कोटा के एच०एच० भीमसिंह (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1973-74 (iv) 1, 85,354 रुपये (v) 3,89,950 रुपये (vi) 3,31,171 रुपये (vii) 2,63,473 रुपये।
- (2) (i) मैसर्स असोसियेटेड स्टोन इन्डस्ट्रीज (कोटा) प्रा० लिमिटेड रामगन्ज मंडी (ii) कम्पनी (iii) 1974-75 (iv) 14,92,000 रुपये (v) 15,62,430 रुपये (vi) 8,98,448 रुपये (vii) 8,98,448 रुपये।

[सं० न्या०/प्र० 287/आई० टी०/77-78/847]

ORDER

Jaipur, the 26th September, 1977

S.O. 3120.—In exercise of the powers delegated by the Central Government under sub-section (1) of section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and under the authority given by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Government of India, New Delhi, I, the undersigned, hereby publish the names and other particulars of the assessee who during the financial year 1976-77 have been assessed on a total income of Rs. 2 lakhs or more (in cases of individuals and Hindu Undivided Families) and on an income of Rs. 10 lakhs or more (in cases of Firms, Association of Persons and Companies), publication of which has been considered necessary in public interest (As per annexure).

ANNEXURE

NAMES OF ALL INDIVIDUALS AND HINDU UNDIVIDED FAMILIES ASSESSED ON TOTAL INCOME OF RS. 2 LAKHS OR MORE AND FIRMS ASSOCIATION OF PERSONS AND COMPANIES ASSESSED ON TOTAL INCOME OF RS. 10 LAKHS OR MORE DURING THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1976-77.

1. (i) H. H. Bhim Singh of Kota, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1973-74, (iv) Rs. 1,85,354, (v) Rs. 3,89,950, (vi) Rs. 3,31,171, (vii) Rs. 2,63,473.

2. (i) M/s. Associated Stone Industries (Kota) P. Ltd., Ramganj Mandi, (ii) Company, (iii) 1974-75, (iv) Rs. 14,92,000, (v) Rs. 15,68,450, (vi) Rs. 8,98,448, (vii) Rs. 8,98,448.

[No. J/Pub. 287/IT/77-78/847]

आदेश

क्र० आ० 3121.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43वां) की धारा 287 की उपधारा (1) के तहत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सौंपी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड राजस्व एवं बीमा विभाग वित्त मंत्रालय भारत सरकार नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रदत्त प्राधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, अधोहस्ताक्षर कर्ता एतद्वारा उन लोगों के नाम व अन्य विवरण प्रकाशित करता हूँ जिन पर वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 271(1) (अ), 271(1) (क), 271(1) (ख), 273 एवं 221 के तहत चुक करने वालों पर 5,000 या इससे ऊपर की रकम की पेनल्टी लगाई गई तथा जिसका प्रकाशन जनहित में आवश्यक समझा गया है (परिशिष्ट के अनुसार)।

परिशिष्ट

बर्ग 'ब' (कैटेगरी 'बी')

वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 में जिन लोगों पर 5000 रुपये से अधिक की पेनल्टी लगाई गई है उनके नाम—

- (1) (i) धोमती निरंजना देवी कुशालगढ़ हाउस, जयपुर (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1974-75, (iv) 12,777 रुपये।
- (2) (i) मैसर्स हाफिज अब्दुल्ला खां एण्ड ब्रदर्स, घाट गेट, जयपुर (ii) फर्म (iii) 1972-73, (iv) 10,976 रुपये।
- (3) (i) भूरामल राजमल सुराना लाल कटला, जयपुर (ii) फर्म (iii) 1965-66 (iv) 10,252 रुपये।
- (4) (i) कन्हैयालाल घाटी वाला परतानियों का रास्ता, जयपुर (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1972-73 (iv) 16,550 रुपये।

[सं० न्या०/प्र० 287/आई० टी०/77-78/848]

ORDER

S.O. 3121.—In exercise of the powers delegated by the Central Government under sub-section (1) of Section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and under the authority given by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Government of India, New Delhi, I, the undersigned hereby publish the names and other particulars of the persons on whom a penalty of Rs. 5,000 and above was levied for defaults under section 271(1)(a), 271(1)(b), 271(1)(c), 273 and 221 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 during the financial year 1976-77, publication of which has been considered necessary in public interest. (As per annexure).

ANNEXURE

'CATEGORY B'

LIST OF PERSONS ON WHOM PENALTY OF NOT LESS THAN Rs. 5,000 WAS IMPOSED DURING THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1976-77.

1. (i) Smt. Niranjana Devi, Kushalgarh House, Jaipur, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1974-75, (iv) Rs. 12,777.
2. (i) M/s. Hafiz Abdulla Khan & Bros., Ghatgate, Jaipur, (ii) Firm, (iii) 1972-73, (iv) Rs. 10,976.
3. (i) M/s. Bhuramal Rajmal Surana, Lal Kalla, Jaipur, (ii) Firm, (iii) 1965-66, (iv) Rs. 10,252.
4. (i) Shri Kanhiya Lal Ghatiwala, Partaniyon Ka Rasta, Jaipur, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1972-73, (iv) Rs. 16,550.

[No. J/Pub. 287/IT/77-78/848]

आदेश

क्र० आ० 3122.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43वां) की धारा 287 की उपधारा (1) के तहत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सौंपी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये एवं केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड राजस्व एवं बीमा विभाग, वित्त मंत्रालय भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रदत्त प्राधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुये मैं, अधोहस्ताक्षर कर्ता, एतद्वारा 1976-77 के दौरान कर देने में चूक करने वालों के नाम व अन्य विवरण प्रकाशित करता हूँ जिनके नामों का प्रकाशन (परिशिष्ट के अनुसार) जनहित में आवश्यक समझा गया है।

परिशिष्ट

31-3-77 को जिन चूक कर्ताओं में 1,00,000 रुपये से ऊपर की मांग बकाया है—उनकी सूची-आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 287 के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशन के लिये

- | | रुपए |
|---|----------|
| 1. मैसर्स बलदेवदास रामेश्वर लाल, भीलवाड़ा | 6,71,699 |
| 2. मैसर्स कोटा स्टूव बोर्ड लिमिटेड, कोटा | 1,24,742 |
| 3. मैसर्स कोटा ट्रांसपोर्ट कम्पनी, कोटा | 2,42,557 |

[सं० न्या० प्र० 287/आई० टी०/77-78/850]

ORDER

S.O. 3122.—In exercise of the powers delegated by the Central Government under section (1) of Section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (41 of 1961), and under the authority given by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Government of India, New Delhi, I, the undersigned hereby publish the names and other particulars of tax defaulters during the financial year 1976-77, publication of which has been considered necessary in public interest (As per annexure).

ANNEXURE

LIST OF DEFAULTERS AS ON 31-3-1977 IN WHICH DEMAND IS OUTSTANDING MORE THAN RS. 1 LAKH FOR PUBLICATION U/S 287 OF THE I.T. ACT, 1961—

1. M/s. Baldeo Dass Rameshwar Lal Bhilwara. Rs. 6,71,699.
2. M/s. Kota Straw Board Ltd., Kota Rs. 2,24,742.
3. M/s. Kota Transport Co., Kota. Rs. 2,42,557.

[No. J/Pub. 287/IT/77-78/850]

आदेश

जयपुर, 27 सितम्बर, 1977

क्रा० शा० 3123.—संपत्ति कर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27वां) की धारा 42(घ) के तहत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सौंपी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये एवं केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रदत्त प्राधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं, अधोहस्ताक्षरकर्ता, एतद्वारा उन लोगों के नाम व अन्य विवरण प्रकाशित करता हूँ जिनकी वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान संपत्ति कर के लिये निर्धारित संपत्ति 10 लाख या इसके ऊपर है तथा जिनका प्रकाशन अनर्हित में आवश्यक समझा गया है। (परिशिष्ट के अनुसार)

परिशिष्ट

वर्ग 'ई' (कैटेगरी 'ई')

वित्त वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान जिन लोगों की संपत्ति-संपत्तिकर के लिये 10 लाख या इससे ऊपर निर्धारित की गई उनकी सूची निम्न प्रकार से है—

1. (i) श्री विनयचन्द प्रवीणचन्द द्वारा बी०सी० नुर्खुश जी जोहरी बाजार, जयपुर, (ii) अवि० हिन्दू परिवार, (iii) 1971-72, (iv) 5,53,252 रुपये, (v) 12,48,450 रुपये, (vi) 65,273 रुपये, (vii) 44,064 रुपये।
2. (i) श्री मन्ना लाल सुराना, हनुमान जी का रास्ता, जयपुर (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1968-69 (iv) 9,95,361 रुपये (v) 16,27,130 रुपये (vi) 19,542 रुपये, (vii) 19,542 रुपये।
3. (i) श्री मन्ना लाल सुराना, हनुमान जी का रास्ता, जयपुर (ii) व्यक्ति (iv) 69-70 (iv) 10,45,949 रुपये (v) 19,66,770 रुपये (vi) 31,170 रुपये, (vii) 31,170 रुपये।
4. (i) श्री मन्ना लाल सुराना, हनुमान जी का रास्ता, जयपुर, (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1970-71, (iv) 20,97,417 रुपये, (v) 15,50,050 रुपये, (vi) 20,751 रुपये, (vii) 20,751 रुपये।
5. (i) श्रीमती बी० डी० सुराना द्वारा श्री मन्ना लाल सुराना, हनुमान जी का रास्ता, जयपुर, (ii) व्यक्ति, (iii) 1974-75, (iv) 7,62,900 रुपये, (v) 11,04,085 रुपये, (vi) 7,862 रुपये, (vii) 7,862 रुपये।
6. (i) श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी बांगूर, डीडवाना, (ii) व्यक्ति, (iii) 1976-77, (iv) 10,72,333 रुपये, (v) 11,38,330 रुपये, (vi) 25,533 रुपये, (vii) 25,533 रुपये।
7. (i) श्री मिरेश कंवर लोटा, अजमेर, (ii) व्यक्ति, (iii) 1976-77, (iv) 7,45,002 रुपये, (v) 12,31,980 रुपये, (vi) 22,279 रुपये, (vii) 12,350 रुपये।

8. (i) श्रीमती कोमी पी० मेखालजी माउन्ट आबू (ii) व्यक्ति (iii) 1970-71 (iv) 8,95,113 रुपये, (v) 10,11,670 रुपये, (vi) 7,073 रुपये (vii) 7,073 रुपये।

[सं० न्याय/प्र० सं० कर/76-77/860]

सी० एन० वैष्णव, आयकर एवं संपत्ति कर आयुक्त

ORDER

Jaipur, the 27th September, 1977

S.O. 3123.—In exercise of the powers delegated by the Central Government under section 42A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957), and under the authority given by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Government of India, New Delhi, I, the undersigned, hereby publish the names and other particulars of the assessee who have been assessed to Wealth-tax on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year 1976-77, publication of which has been considered necessary in the public interest. (As per Annexure).

ANNEXURE

'CATEGORY E'

Following is the list of assessee who have been assessed to net wealth over Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year 1976-77.

1. (i) Shri Vinaychand Praveenchand C/o V. C. Dhurlabhji Johari Bazar, Jaipur, (ii) HUF, (iii) 1971-72, (iv) 5,53,252, (v) 12,48,450, (vi) 65,273, (vii) 44,064.
2. (i) Shri Manna Lal Surana, Hanumanji Ka Rasta, Jaipur, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1968-69, (iv) 9,95,361, (v) 16,27,130, (vi) 19,542, (vii) 19,542.
3. (i) Shri Manna Lal Surana, Hanumanji Ka Rasta, (ii) Individual, (iii) 69-70, (iv) 10,45,949, (v) 19,66,770, (vi) 31,170, (vii) 31,170.
4. (i) Shri Manna Lal Surana Hanumanji ka Rasta, Jaipur, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1970-71, (iv) 20,97,417, (v) 15,50,050, (vi) 20,751, (vii) 20,751.
5. (i) Smt. B. D. Surana C/o Shri Manna Lal Surana, Hanumanji ka Rasta, Jaipur, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1974-75, (iv) 7,62,900, (v) 11,04,085, (vi) 7,862, (vii) 7,862.
6. (i) Smt. Pushpa Devi Bangur, Diddwana, (ii) Individual, (iii) 1976-77, (iv) 10,72,333, (v) 11,38,330, (vi) 25,533, (vii) 25,533.
7. (i) Shri Sireesh Kanwar Lodha, Ajmer, (ii) Individual (iii) 1976-77, (iv) 7,45,002, (v) 12,31,980, (vi) 22,279, (vii) 12,350.
8. (i) Mrs. Coomic P, Meranjil Mount Abu, (ii) Individual (iii) 1970-71, (iv) 8,95,113, (v) 10,11,670, (vi) 7,073, (vii) 7,073.

[No. J/Pub. WT/76-77/860]

C. N. VAISHNAV Commissioner, Income-Tax and Wealth Tax.

आयकर आयुक्त का कार्यालय, हरियाणा और चण्डीगढ़

रोहतक, 26 सितम्बर, 1977

आयकर

क्रा० शा० 3124.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक मना समीचीन है कि 31-3-1977 को दो वर्ष या अधिक की अवधि के लिये 1,00,000 रु० अथवा उससे अधिक कर की आवश्यक

में चूक करने वाले व्यक्तियों से सम्बन्धित, यहाँ इसके पश्चात् विनिर्दिष्ट नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित की जाएँ:

रोहतक, 27 सितम्बर, 1977

और यतः आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 43) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 द्वारा सभी आयकर आयुक्तों को वित्तीय वर्ष 1976-77 के अन्त में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर स्थित करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित नाम, पते तथा कर चूक की राशि प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है,

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में पूर्वोक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

अनुसूची

आयकर विभाग हरियाणा और चण्डीगढ़, रोहतक

आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 287 के अधीन चूककर्ताओं की सूची जैसी 31-3-1977 को थी (i) चूक की कुल रकम के लिए जो दो वर्ष और उससे अधिक अवधि के लिए है।

श्री ब्यास देव डोगरा, प्रोप्राईटर मैगर्ज डोगरा स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, फरीदाबाद (i) रु० 4,90,285

[फा० सं० 418(3)/77-78/एच० व्द०]

(Office of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Haryana and Chandigarh)

Rohtak, the 26th September, 1977

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3124.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to persons in default of payment of tax of Rs. 1,00,000 or more for period exceeding 2 years or more as on 31-3-77;

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Government by its order dated 10th August, 1977 authorised all the Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses and the amount of tax in default relating to assessee within their jurisdiction as at the end of financial year 1976-77;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 10th August, 1977, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid.

SCHEDULE

Income-tax Department, Haryana and Chandigarh

List of defaulters as on 31-3-1977 u/s 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (i) for total amount in default for a period of two years or more.

1. Sh. Bias Dev Dogra, Prop. M/s. Dogra Steel Industries, Faridabad (i) Rs. 4,90,285.

[F. No. 418(3)/77-78/HQ]

फा० सं० 3125.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है कि वित्तीय वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान यहाँ इसके पश्चात् विनिर्दिष्ट ऐसे सभी करदाताओं के,

(1) जो व्यक्ति अथवा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्ब हैं, जिनकी आय दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा

(2) जो फर्म, कम्पनियाँ, अथवा अन्य व्यक्ति-संगम हैं, जिनकी आय दस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है,

आय तथा उससे सम्बन्धित अन्य विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित की जाएँ।

और यतः आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 43) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के द्वारा सभी आयकर आयुक्तों को, वित्तीय वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर (रिक्त) करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित नाम, पते, हैसियत तथा कर निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करदाताओं द्वारा विवरणित आय निर्धारित आय, देय कर तथा दिए गए कर को प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में उपर्युक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

अनुसूची

आयकर विभाग, हरियाणा एवं चण्डीगढ़

ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों तथा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम, जिनकी आय वित्तीय वर्ष 1976-77 के दौरान दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है तथा सभी फर्मों, व्यक्ति-संगम तथा कम्पनियों के नाम जिनकी आय दस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है:—

(i) हैसियत के लिए है—‘आई’ व्यक्ति के लिए, ‘सी’ कम्पनी के लिए, ‘एफ’ फर्म के लिए।

(ii) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए, (iii) दी गई आय विवरणी के लिए,

(iv) निर्धारित आय के लिए, (v) दिए जाने वाले कर के लिए।

(vi) दिए गए कर के लिए है।

(1) श्री जगत नाथ कौशल, चण्डीगढ़ (i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1976-77

(iii) 2,16,750 (iv) 2,19,420 (v) 1,45,512 (vi) 1,45,512

(2) श्री भूशोक राज नाथ, पानीपत (i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1975-76

(iii) 2,45,040 (iv) 2,53,090 (v) 1,72,800 (vi) 1,65,300

(3) श्री उदय नाथ, पानीपत (i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii)

2,28,140 (iv) 2,26,760 (v) 1,52,270 (vi) 1,50,570

- (4) श्री सुमित नाम, पानीपत (i) 'आई' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 2,22,490 (iv) 2,21,100 (v) 1,47,920 (vi) 1,46,786
- (5) अवेरी 'जे' श्रील प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, चण्डीगढ़ (i) 'सी' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) 10,52,035 (iv) 10,79,810 (v) 6,80,284 (vi) 7,64,929
- (6) राज वुलन इंडस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (i) 'एफ' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) 11,62,260 (iv) 11,87,206 (v) 2,91,436 (vi) 2,91,270

[क्र० सं० 418(1)/77-78/मुख्यालय]

एम० एस० उन्नीनयार, आयकर प्रायुक्त

Rohtak, the 27th September, 1977

S.O. 3125.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assessee :

(i) being individual, or Hindu undivided families, who have been assessed on an income of more than two lakhs of rupees, and

(ii) being firms, companies, or other association of persons, who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees, during financial year 1976-77.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Govt. has by its order dated 10th August, 1977, authorised all Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year, relating to assessee within their jurisdiction and the income returned by, the income assessed on, the tax payable by, and the tax paid by, such assessee during the financial year 1976-77;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 10th August, 1977, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid.

SCHEDULE

Income Tax Department, Haryana and Chandigarh

Names of all individuals, and Hindu Undivided Families assessed on an income of more than Rs. two lakhs and of

all firms, Association of persons and companies assessed on an income of more than Rs. ten lakh during the financial year 1976-77 (i) for Status 'T' for individual, 'C' for company, 'F' for Firm, (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for income returned (iv) for income assessed; (v) for tax payable and (vi) for tax paid :—

- Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal, Chandigarh (i) 'T' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) Rs. 2,16,750/- (iv) Rs. 2,19,420/- (v) Rs. 1,45,512, (vi) Rs. 1,45,512.
- Shri Ashok Raj Nath, Panipat (i) 'T' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 2,45,040, (iv) Rs. 2,53,090, (v) Rs. 1,72,800, (vi) Rs. 1,65,300.
- Shri Udhey Nath, Panipat (i) 'T' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 2,28,140/- (iv) Rs. 2,26,760/- (v) Rs. 1,52,270/- (vi) Rs. 1,50,570/-.
- Shri Sumit Nath, Panipat (i) 'T' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 2,22,490/- (iv) Rs. 2,21,100/- (v) Rs. 1,47,920/- (vi) Rs. 1,46,786.
- Avery Free Wheel Private Limited, I, Area, Chandigarh (i) 'C' (ii) 1976-77, (iii) Rs. 10,52,035, (iv) Rs. 10,79,810, (v) Rs. 6,80,284, (vi) Rs. 7,64,929.
- Raj Woolen Indus., Panipat (i) 'F' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) Rs. 11,62,260, (iv) Rs. 11,87,206, (v) Rs. 2,91,436, (vi) Rs. 2,91,270/-.

[F. No. 418(1)/77-78/HQ]

M. S. UNNINAYAR, Commissioner of Income-tax

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

क्र० अ० 3126:—क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री आई० बी० सत्यानारायणमूर्ति को 1 अक्टूबर, 1977 से आरम्भ होकर 31 दिसम्बर, 1977 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए नागार्जुन ग्रामीण बैंक का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 3-19/77 आर०आर०बी०]

सी० आर० बिस्वास, उप सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

S.O. 3126.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Y. V. Satyanarayana Murthy as the Chairman of the Nagarguna Grammeena Bank, Khammam for the period commencing on the 1st October, 1977 and ending with the 31st December, 1977.

[No. F. 3-19/77 RRB]

C. R. BISWAS, Dy. Secy.

भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

नई दिल्ली, 22 सितम्बर, 1977

New Delhi, 22nd September, 1977

क्र० अ० 3127.—भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में सितम्बर 1977 के दिनांक 7 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा
S.O. 3127.—An account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India, Act, 1934 for the week ended the 7th day of September, 1977.

व्युत्पन्न विभाग

Issue Department

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट Notes held in the Banking Department	13,41,55,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन: Gold Coin and Bullion	187,80,46,000	
संचलन में नोट Notes in circulation	7919,28,76,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ (a) Held in India	—	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट Total notes issued		7932,70,31,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ (b) Held outside India		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां Foreign Securities	1271,73,97,000	
			कुल Total		1459,54,43,000
			रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin		23,00,40,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां Government of India Rupee Securities		6450,15,48,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		—
कुल देयताएं Total Liabilities		7932,70,31,000	कुल आस्तियां Total Assets		7932,70,31,000

दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1977
Dated the 7th day of September, 1977

एम० नरसिंहम्, गवर्नर
M. NARASIMHAM, Governor.

2 सितम्बर, 1977 को भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण
Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 2nd September, 1977

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
चुक्ता पूंजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	13,41,55,000
आरक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	4,19,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	495,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	5,03,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilization) Fund	165,00,00,000	खरीदे और धुनाये गये बिल : Bills Purchased and Discounted :	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	715,00,00,000	(क) देशी (a) Internal	124,40,81,000
		(ख) विदेशी (b) External	—
		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल (c) Government Treasury Bills	208,28,95,000
		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बाकाया Balances Held Abroad	1924,01,72,000

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
जमा राशियां: Deposits:		निवेश Investments	830,71,48,000
(क) सरकारी (a) Government		ऋण और अधिम : Loans and Advances to :	
(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार (i) Central Government	63,46,89,000	(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार को (i) Central Government	—
(2) राज्य सरकार (ii) State Governments	15,23,49,000	(2) राज्य सरकारों को (ii) State Governments	122,11,91,000
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		ऋण और अधिम : Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक (i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	1449,92,63,000	(1) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को (i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	318,09,44,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक (ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	30,68,94,000	(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को (ii) State Co-operative Banks	307,79,88,000
(iii) गैर-अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक (iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,98,33,000	(3) दूसरों को (iii) Others	1,78,00,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक (iv) Other Banks	1,67,77,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्धकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अधिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(ग) अन्य (c) Others	1925,79,88,000	(क) ऋण और अधिम : (a) Loans and Advances to:	
देय बिल Bills Payable	174,99,36,000	(1) राज्य सरकारों को (i) State Governments	98,24,99,000
अन्य देयताएं Other Liabilities	548,58,66,000	(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को (ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,81,81,000
		(3) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को (iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	—
		(4) कृषि पुनर्बिल और विकास निगम को (iv) Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	171,60,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	8,02,11,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम Loans and Advances from National Agricul- tural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	128,17,58,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (बीर्धकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अधिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अधिम (a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	529,18,44,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	—
		अन्य आस्तियां Other Assets	941,58,06,000
रुपए Rupees	5742,35,95,000	रुपये Rupees	5742,35,95,000

दिनांक, 7 मितम्बर, 1977

Dated the 7th day of September, 1977

एम० नरसिहम्, गवर्नर

M. NARASIMHAM, Governor.

[No. F. 10/2/77-B.O.I.]

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

कां० 3128.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में अगस्त, 1977 के दिनांक 26 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

S.O. 3128.—An account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 for the week ended the 26th day of August, 1977

बैंक विभाग

Issue Department

व्ययताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	प्राप्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट Notes held in the Banking Department	35,21,47,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन: Gold Coin and Bullion		
संचलन में नोट Notes in circulation	7898,44,53,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ (a) Held in India	187,80,46,000	
जारी किये गए कुल नोट Total notes issued		7933,66,00,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ (b) Held outside India		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां Foreign Securities	1271,73,77,000	
			जंश Total		1459,54,43,000
			रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin		23,96,08,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां Government of India Rupee Securities		6450,15,49,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
कुल व्ययताएं Total Liabilities		7933,66,00,000	कुल प्राप्तियां Total Assets		7933,66,00,000

दिनांक 31 अगस्त, 1977

Dated 31st Day of August, 1977

एम० नरसिम्हम्, गवर्नर

M. NARASIMHAM, Governor

26 अगस्त, 1977 को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण
Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 26th August, 1966

व्ययताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	प्राप्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
1	2	3	4
चुक्ता पूंजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	35,21,47,000
प्रारक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	5,53,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	495,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	4,89,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	165,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल Bills Purchased and Discounted:	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	715,00,00,000	(क) देशी (a) Internal	119,56,28,000
		(ख) विदेशी (b) External	..
		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल (c) Government Treasury Bills	258,94,73,000
		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया Balances Held Abroad*	1929,26,26,000

1	2	3	4
जमा राशियाँ:— Deposits:—		निवेश Investments**	684,12,80,000
(क) सरकारी (a) Government		ऋण और अग्रिम :— Loans and Advances to:—	
(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार (i) Central Government	73,69,85,000	(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार को (i) Central Government	
(2) राज्य सरकारें (ii) State Governments	10,70,68,000	(2) राज्य सरकारी को (ii) State Governments	158,21,54,000
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		ऋण और अग्रिम :— Loans and Advances to:—	
(1) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक (i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	1478,37,27,000	(1) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को (i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	465,02,07,000
(2) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक (ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	30,31,78,000	(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को (ii) State Co-operative Banks	296,98,88,000
(3) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक (iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,95,03,000	(3) दूसरों को (iii) Others	1,45,00,000
(4) अन्य बैंक (iv) Other Banks	91,90,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण अग्रिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(ग) अन्य (c) Others	1958,12,05,000	(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :— (a) Loans and Advances:—	
		(1) राज्य सरकारों को (i) State Governments	98,24,98,000
		(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को (ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,54,83,000
		(3) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को (iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	—
		(4) कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम की (iv) Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation	171,60,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	8,12,11,000
देय बिल Bills payable	163,00,74,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances from National Agricul- tural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
अन्य देयताएं Other Liabilities	559,64,73,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	127,65,35,000
रुपये Rupees	5806,74,03,000	राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम (a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	526,45,50,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बॉन्ड्स/डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	—
		अन्य आस्तियां Other Assets	911,21,81,000
		रुपये Rupees	5806,74,03,000

दिनांक 31 अगस्त, 1977

Dated the 31st day of August, 1977

एम० नरसिम्हम्, गवर्नर
M. NARASIMHAM, Governor
[No. 10/2/77-B.O.I.]एल० आर० कटारिया, अनुभाग अधिकारी
L. R. KATARIA, Section Officer

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 1977

आयकर

कां०आ० 3129.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 126 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 1 (फा०सं० 55/233/63-आई०टी०), तारीख 18-5-64 की अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

उक्त अनुसूची में क्रम सं० 13(ख) के सामने की समस्त प्रविष्टियों का लोप किया जाएगा।

उक्त अनुसूची में क्रम सं० 13(क) की क्रम सं० 13 के रूप में पुनः संख्यांकित किया जाएगा और उसके सामने की समस्त प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी :

1	2	3	4	5
13. आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (21) से (23क) और उपधारा (23ग) और धारा 11 और 12 के अधीन छूट का दावा करने वाले या उसके हकदार कलकत्ता शहर और हावड़ा तथा 24 परगना के सिविल जिलों के सभी व्यक्ति।	आयकर अधिकारी, न्याय सचिव, कलकत्ता	सहायक-आयकर निरीक्षण आयुक्त जिसे स्तम्भ 3 में उल्लिखित आयकर अधिकारियों की बाबत निरीक्षण सहायक आयुक्त के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए नियुक्त किया गया है।	सहायक आयकर निरीक्षण आयुक्त जिसे स्तम्भ 3 में उल्लिखित आयकर अधिकारियों के विनिश्चयों के विरुद्ध अपील सुनने की शक्तियाँ सौंपी गई हैं।	आयकर आयुक्त पश्चिमी बंगाल जिन्हें स्तम्भ 3 में निर्दिष्ट आयकर अधिकारियों पर अधिकांशता प्राप्त है।

यह अधिसूचना 6-6-1977 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 1800 (फा०सं० 188/5/77-आई टो (ए 1))]

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 4th June, 1977

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 3129.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule to its Notification No. I (F. No. 55/233/63-IT) dated 18-5-64 as amended from time to time.

In the said schedule, all the entries against serial No. 13(b) shall be deleted.

In the said schedule, serial No. 13(a) shall be renumbered as serial 13 and all the entries against the same shall be substituted by the following :—

SCHEDULE

1	2	3	4	5
13. All persons in the City of Calcutta and Civil Districts of Howrah and 24-Parganas claiming or entitled to exemption under Sub-sections (21) to (23A) and sub-sec. (23C) of Section 10 and under sections 11 & 12 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961).	Income-tax Officer, Trust Circle, Calcutta.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner Of Income-tax who has been appointed to perform the functions of an Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of Income-tax Officer mentioned in Col. 3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax who has been vested with powers to hear appeals against the decision of the Income tax Officer referred to in Col. 3.	Commissioner of Income-tax, West Bengal having jurisdiction over the Income-tax Officer referred to in Column 3.

This order shall take effect from 6-6-1977.

[No. 1800 (F. No. 188/5/77-IT (AT))]

का० अ० 3130.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 1495 [फा० सं० 191/26/76-आई०टी० (ए-1)] तारीख 23 सितम्बर, 1976 से उपायुक्त अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है,।

1. क्रम सं० 2, 2क और 2ख के सामने स्तम्भ (1), (2) और (3) के सीधे विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात्:—

आयकर आयुक्त	मुख्यालय	अधिकारिता
(1)	(2)	(3)
2 आन्ध्र प्रदेश-I	हैदराबाद	1 कम्पनी सर्किल, हैदराबाद 2 बेतन सर्किल, हैदराबाद 3 विशेष सर्किल I, हैदराबाद 4 संपदा-शुल्क-एवं-आयकर सर्किल, हैदराबाद। 5 संपदा-शुल्क-एवं-आयकर सर्किल, काकीनाडा। 6 संपदा शुल्क एवं आयकर सर्किल, गुन्तूर 7 विशेष सर्किल, II हैदराबाद 8 परियोजना सर्किल, हैदराबाद 9 गुन्तूर सर्किल, गुन्तूर 10 महबूबनगर सर्किल, महबूबनगर 11 सांगारेड्डी सर्किल, सांगारेड्डी 12 अनन्तपुर सर्किल, अनन्तपुर 13 हिन्दूपुर सर्किल, हिन्दूपुर 14 कुड्डापु सर्किल, कुड्डापु 15 प्रोदुतुर सर्किल, प्रोदुतुर 16 अडोनी सर्किल, अडोनी 17 नन्दयाल सर्किल, नन्दयाल 18 कुरनूल सर्किल, कुरनूल
2ए आन्ध्र प्रदेश II,	हैदराबाद	1 सर्किल I, हैदराबाद 2 करीमनगर सर्किल, करीमनगर 3 काकीनाडा सर्किल-I काकीनाडा 4 काकीनाडा सर्किल-II काकीनाडा 5 आमलापुरम सर्किल, आमलापुरम 6 तनूक सर्किल, तनूक 7 पालाकोले सर्किल, पालाकोले 8 एलूरु सर्किल, एलूरु 9 विजयवाड़ा सर्किल, विजयवाड़ा 10 मछलीपट्टनम सर्किल, मछलीपट्टनम 11 गुडीबाडा सर्किल, गुडीबाडा 12 तेनाली सर्किल, तेनाली
2 बी आन्ध्र प्रदेश-III, हैदराबाद		1 सर्किल-II, हैदराबाद 2 निजामाबाद सर्किल, निजामाबाद 3 निर्मल सर्किल, निर्मल 4 सर्किल-III, हैदराबाद 5 वारंगल सर्किल, वारंगल 6 खमाम सर्किल, खमाम 7 श्रीकाकुलम सर्किल, श्रीकाकुलम 8 विशाखापट्टनम सर्किल, विशाखापट्टनम

1	2	3
		9 विजयनगरम सर्किल, विजयनगरम 10 अन्नाकापल्ली सर्किल, अन्नाकापल्ली 11 राजामुंदरी सर्किल, राजामुंदरी 12 विशेष सर्किल-III, हैदराबाद 13 नैल्लोर सर्किल, नैल्लोर 14 चित्तूर सर्किल, चित्तूर 15 निरुपति सर्किल, निरुपति 16 बपतला सर्किल, बपतला
यह अधिसूचना 16-6-1977 से प्रभावी होगी।		

[सं० 1802/फा० सं० 187/14/77-आई०टी० (ए-1)]

S.O. 3130.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 1495 [F. No. 191/26/76-II(AI)] dated the 23rd September, 1976.

1. Existing entries under columns (1), (2) and (3) against S. No. 2, 2A and 2B shall be substituted by the following entries :

Income-tax commissioner	Head-quarters	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
2. Andhra Pradesh-I.	Hyderabad	1. Company Circle, Hyderabad. 2. Salary Circle, Hyderabad. 3. Special Circle-I, Hyderabad. 4. E.D.-cum-Income-tax Cir., Hyderabad. 5. E.D.-cum-Income-tax Cir., Kakinada. 6. E.D.-cum-Income-tax Cir., Guntur. 7. Special Circle-II, Hyderabad. 8. Project Circle, Hyderabad. 9. Guntur Circle, Guntur. 10. Mahaboobnagar Circle, Mahaboobnagar. 11. Sangareddy Circle, Sangareddy. 12. Anantapur Circle, Anantapur. 13. Hindupur Circle, Hindupur. 14. Cuddapah Circle, Cuddapah. 15. Proddutur Circle, Proddutur. 16. Adoni Circle, Adoni. 17. Nandyal Circle, Nandyal. 18. Kurnool Circle, Kurnool.

1	2	3
2A. Andhra Pradesh-II	Hyderabad	1. Circle-I, Hyderabad. 2. Karimnagar Circle, Karimnagar. 3. Kakinada Circle-I, Kakinada. 4. Kakinada Circle-II, Kakinada. 5. Amalapuram Circle, Amalapuram. 6. Tanuku Circle, Tanuku. 7. Palacole Circle, Palacole. 8. Eluru Circle, Eluru. 9. Vijayawada Circle, Vijayawada. 10. Machilipatnam Circle, Machilipatnam. 11. Gudur Circle, Gudur. 12. Tenali Circle, Tenali.

2B. Andhra Pradesh-III.	Hyderabad	1. Circle-II, Hyderabad. 2. Nizamabad Circle, Nizamabad. 3. Nirmal Circle, Nirmal. 4. Circle-III, Hyderabad. 5. Warangal Circle, Warangal. 6. Khammam Circle, Khammam. 7. Srikakulam Circle, Srikakulam. 8. Visakhapatnam Circle, Visakhapatnam. 9. Vizianagaram Circle, Vizianagaram. 10. Anakapalli Circle, Anakapalli. 11. Rajahmundry Circle, Rajahmundry. 12. Spl. Circle-III, Hyderabad. 13. Nellore Circle, Nellore. 14. Chittoor Circle, Chittoor. 15. Tirupathi Circle, Tirupathi. 16. Bapatla C
-------------------------	-----------	--

This notification shall have effect from 16-6-1977.

[No. 1802/F.No. 187/14/77-IT (AI)]

नई दिल्ली, 1 जुलाई, 1977

क्रां.सं. 3131:—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय समय पर यथासंशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना सं. 679 (फा. सं. 187/2/74-आई टी ए-2) तारीख 20 जुलाई, 1974 से उपाख्य अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

क्रम सं. 8-ग और 8-घ की क्रमशः मद सं. 1 और 3 पर की विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा :—

क्रम सं.	आयकर आयुक्त	मुख्यालय	अधिकारिता
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8-ग	दिल्ली	नई दिल्ली	(1) जिला 3 नई दिल्ली [जिला 3 (19) से जिला 3(23) और 3(27) को छोड़कर]।
8-घ	दिल्ली	नई दिल्ली	(3) जिला 3(19), (20) 2(21), (22), (23) और (27) नई दिल्ली।

यह अधिसूचना 1-7-1977 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं. 1850/फा. सं. 187/1/77-आई.टी. (ए. I.)]

एम. शास्त्री, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1977

S.O. 3131.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 679/F. No. 187/2/74-IT (AI) dated 20th July, 1974 as amended from time to time.

Existing entries at item No. 1 and 3 of S. No. 8-C and 8-D respectively shall be substituted by the following :—

S.No.	Commissioner of Income-Tax	Head-quarters	Jurisdiction
8-C	Delhi-IV	New Delhi	(1) Distt. III, New Delhi (except Distt. III (19) to Distt. III (23) and III (27), New Delhi.
8-D	Delhi-V	New Delhi	(3) Distt. III (19), (20), (21), (22), (23) & (27), New Delhi.

This notification shall take effect from 1-7-77.

[No. 1850/F. No. 187/1/77-IT (AI)]

M. SHASTRI, Under Secy.

(अध्यक्ष विभाग)

(रक्षा प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1977

क्रां.सं. 3132:—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित विनियमन में और संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित विनियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन विनियमों का नाम निम्नलिखित सेवा (संशोधन) विनियम, 1977 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 निम्नलिखित सेवा विनियम के अनुच्छेद 1973 में, —

(i) खण्ड (1) के उप खण्ड (क) के परन्तुक के पैरा (ii) के परन्तुक में “संबंधित सरकारी कर्मचारी को अपना अभिवेदन

देने का अवसर वे दिये जाने के पश्चात् शब्दों के स्थान पर “(नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से साठ दिन के भीतर)” कोष्ठक और शब्द रखे जायेंगे ;

(ii) खण्ड (3) में,—

(क) उप-खण्ड (क) में, “यदि वह पदभूत किए जाने, हटाए जाने या अनिवार्य रूप से सेवा-निवृत्ति के पूर्व निवृत्तनाधीन रहने के दौरान अधिवर्षिता पर सेवा निवृत्त न हो गया होता”

शब्दों के स्थान पर “यदि वह निवृत्तनाधीन रहने अथवा न रहने के दौरान अधिवर्षिता पर सेवा-निवृत्त न हो गया होता” शब्द रखे जाएंगे ;

(ख) उप-खण्ड (ख) के परन्तुक में ;

(क) “उसे व्यपदेशन करने का अवसर देने के पश्चात्” शब्दों के पश्चात् “(नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से साठ दिन के भीतर)” कोष्ठक और शब्द अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे ;

(ख) “अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “रकम (पूरी नहीं)” शब्द और कोष्ठक रखे जाएंगे ।

(ग) उप-खण्ड (घ) में ;

(क) “पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “वेतन और भत्तों की रकम (पूरी नहीं)” शब्द और कोष्ठक रखे जाएंगे ।

(ख) “ऐसी अवधि के भीतर” शब्दों के पश्चात् “(जो नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से किसी भी दशा में साठ दिन से अधिक नहीं होगी)” कोष्ठक और शब्द अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे ;

(घ) उप-खण्ड (छ) ;

“पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की अनुपातिक रकम” के स्थान पर “रकम” शब्द रखे जाएंगे ;

(iii) खण्ड (4) उप-खण्ड (ख) (i) में,—

(क) “पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की रकम (पूरी नहीं)” शब्द और कोष्ठक रखे जायेंगे ;

(ख) “ऐसी अवधि के भीतर” शब्दों के पश्चात् “(जो नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से, किसी भी दशा में, साठ दिन से अधिक नहीं होगी)” कोष्ठक और शब्द अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे ;

(iv) खण्ड (5) ;

(क) उप-खण्ड (ग) के परन्तुक में—

(क) “उसे व्यपदेशन करने का अवसर देने” शब्दों के पश्चात् (नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से साठ दिन के भीतर)” कोष्ठक और शब्द अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे ;

(ख) “अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “रकम (पूरी नहीं)” शब्द और कोष्ठक रखे जाएंगे ;

(ख) उपखण्ड (घ) में ;

(क) “पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “वेतन और भत्तों की रकम (पूरी नहीं)” शब्द और कोष्ठक रखे जाएंगे ;

(ख) “ऐसी अवधि के भीतर” शब्दों के पश्चात् “(जो किसी भी दशा में नोटिस तामील किए जाने की तारीख से साठ दिन से अधिक नहीं होगी)” कोष्ठक और शब्द रखे जाएंगे ;

(ग) उपखण्ड (i) में,—

“पूरे वेतन और भत्तों की अनुपातिक रकम” शब्दों के स्थान पर “रकम” शब्द रखा जाएगा ।

(Department of Expenditure)

(Defence Division)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1977

S.O. 3132.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following regulations further to amend the Civil Service Regulations, namely :—

1. (1) These regulations may be called the Civil Service (Amendment) Regulations, 1977.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In Article 193 of the Civil Service Regulations.—

(i) in clause (1), in the proviso to sub-clause (a), in the proviso to paragraph (ii) after the words “after giving the Government servant concerned an opportunity to make his representation”, the brackets and words “(within sixty days from the date on which the notice has been served)” shall be inserted;

(ii) in clause (3),—

(a) in sub-clause (a), for the words “but for his retirement on superannuation while under suspension preceding the dismissal, removal or compulsory retirement”, the words “but for his retirement on superannuation, while under suspension or not” shall be substituted;

(b) in the proviso to sub-clause (b),—

(A) after the words “after giving him an opportunity to make his representation”, the brackets and words “(within sixty days from the date on which the notice has been served)” shall be inserted;

(B) for the word “proportion”, the words and brackets “amount (not being the whole)” shall be substituted;

(c) in sub-clause (d),—

(A) for the words “proportion of the full pay and allowances”, the words and brackets “amount (not being the whole) of the pay and allowances” shall be substituted;

(B) after the words “within such period”, the brackets and words “(which in no case shall exceed sixty days from the date on which the notice has been served)” shall be inserted;

(d) in sub-clause (g), for the words “The proportion of the full pay and allowance”, the words “The amount” shall be substituted;

(iii) in clause (4), in sub-clause (b) (i),—

(a) for the words “proportion of the full pay and allowances”, the words and brackets “amount (not being the whole) of the pay and allowances” shall be substituted;

(b) after the words “within such period”, the brackets and words “(which in no case shall exceed sixty days from the date the notice has been served)” shall be inserted;

(iv) in clause (5),—

(a) in the proviso to sub-clause (c),—

(A) after the words “after giving him an opportunity to make his representation”, the brackets and words “(within sixty days from the date on which the notice has been served)” shall be inserted;

(B) for the word “proportion”, the words and brackets “amount (not being the whole)” shall be substituted;

(b) in sub-clause (e),—

(A) for the words “proportion of the full pay and allowances”, the words and brackets “amount (not being the whole) of the pay and allowances” shall be substituted;

[सं० 7006/ए०जी०/पी०बी०]

एस० एस० जाटव, सहायक वित्तीय
सलाहकार, रक्षा सेवाएं

I. A. RASHID, Dy. Chief Controller

पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 1977

क्र०आ० 3115.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का०आ०सं० 1391 तारीख 18-4-77 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः मक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करते के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (6) की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निवेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बराबर तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में सभी संघकों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मनई जी०जी०एस० से सी०टी०एफ० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना।

राज्य :	गुजरात	जिला :	मेहसाना	तालुका :	कलोल
गांव	ब्लॉक सं०	हेक्टेयर	ए०आर०ई	सेन्टेयर	
करोली	320	0	32	00	

[मं० 12016/2/77-प्रोडक्शन]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1977

S.O. 3135.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum, S.O. No. 1391 dated 18-4-77 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Acquisition of right of USER for laying pipeline from sanand GGS to CTF.

State : Gujarat	District : Mehsana	Taluka : Kalol			
Village	Block No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare	
Karoli	320	0	32	0	

[No. 12016/2/77-Prod.]

क्र०आ० 3136.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में जी०जी०एस०-VIII से एम०ओ०के०ओ०आई०एल०टी० कनेक्शन तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग मकरपुरा, रोड, बड़ोवरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो किमी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

जी०जी०एस०-VIII से एम० ओ० के० ओ० आई० एल० टी० कनेक्शन तक पाइप लाइन बिछाना

राज्य :	गुजरात	जिला :	मेहसाना	तालुका :	कलोल
गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	क्षेत्रफल	हेक्टेयर	ए०आर०ई	सेन्टेयर
1	2	3	4	5	
कलोल	676/3	0	06	90	
	676/4	0	05	47	
	667/2	0	27	64	
	665	0	13	50	
	664	0	12	00	
	660/2	0	07	20	
	663/1	0	00	50	
	662	0	06	45	
	661/2	0	06	90	
	661/1	0	05	55	
	658	0	26	70	
	612	0	24	30	

1	2	3	4	5
	616	0	14	29
	618	0	21	60
बोरीसाना	ब्लॉक नं०			
	979	0	53	25
	793	0	00	25
	कार्ट-ट्रैक	0	01	80
	709	0	10	50
	713	0	14	25
	715	0	14	40
	716	0	19	05
	718	0	12	75
	689	0	10	72
	640	0	39	90
	कार्ट-ट्रैक	0	00	80
	639	0	12	00
	642	0	00	30
	638	0	14	25
	620	0	15	00

[सं० 12016/2/77-प्रोडक्शन-I]

S.O. 3136.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from GGS VIII to SOKOIL TEE connection in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying pipeline from GGS VIII SOKOIL TEE connection				
State : Gujarat		District : Mehsana		Taluka : Kalol
Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Area	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
Kalol	676/3	0	06	90
	676/4	0	05	47
	667/2	0	27	64
	665	0	13	50
	664	0	12	00
	660/2	0	07	20
	663/1	0	00	50
	662	0	06	45
	661/2	0	06	90
	661/1	0	05	55
	658	0	26	70
	612	0	24	30
	616	0	14	29
	618	0	21	60

1	2	3	4	5
Borisana	Block No.			
	979	0	53	25
	793	0	00	25
	Cart track	0	01	80
	709	0	10	50
	713	0	14	25
	715	0	14	40
	716	0	19	05
	718	0	12	75
	689	0	10	72
	640	0	39	90
	Cart track	0	00	80
	639	0	12	00
	642	0	00	30
	638	0	14	25
	620	0	15	00

[No. 12016/2/77-Prod. I]

कां० 3137.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० सनद-30 से डब्ल्यू.एन.आई. में एम०-15 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए, पाइप-लाइन सेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के लिए प्रयोजन के लिये एन.एन.आई. अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह एन.ए. द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बर्णित कि उसमें भूमि में हितवश कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आशेष सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग बड़ोदरा—9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आशेष करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसके मुतवाई व्यक्तिगत: हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० सनद 30 से डब्ल्यू.एन.आई. में एम० 15 तक पाइप-लाइन बिछाना
राज्य : गुजरात जिला : मेहसना

गांव	सर्वेक्ष सं०	क्षेत्रफल
1	2	3
1	2	3
तालुका : कादी		
थोव	1423	0 32 10
तालुका : कर्नाल		
जेथवाज	532	0 01 00
	530	0 09 00
	529/1 और 2	0 03 60
	528/1 A	0 08 40
	512	0 10 80

1	2	3	4	5
	511	0	07	50
	510/1	0	09	30
	465/1	0	10	35
	कार्ट-ट्रेक	0	01	00
	504	0	04	50
	503	0	09	45
	502	0	09	30
	467	0	00	50
	501	0	08	70
	469	0	12	75
	470	0	14	10
	कार्ट-ट्रेक	0	00	75
	433/1	0	07	95
	370	0	09	90
	372/1	0	13	20
	373/2	0	10	95

[सं० 12016, 2/77-प्रोडक्शन-2]

S.O. 3137.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Well No. Sanad-30 to W.H.I. at S.15 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission ;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying Pipeline from well No. Sanad 30 to W.H.I. at S 15
State : Gujarat District : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Area		
		Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
	Taluka : Kadi			
Thol	1423	0	32	10
	Taluka : Kalol			
Jethalaj	532	0	01	00
	530	0	09	00
	529/1 & 2	0	03	60
	528/1A	0	08	40
	512	0	10	80
	511	0	07	50
	510/1	0	09	30
	465/1	0	10	35
	Cart track	0	01	00
	504	0	04	50
	503	0	09	45
	502	0	09	30
	467	0	00	50
	501	0	08	70

1	2	3	4	5
	469	0	12	75
	470	0	14	10
	Cart track	0	00	75
	433/1	0	07	95
	370	0	09	90
	372/1	0	13	20
	373/2	0	10	95

[No. 12016/2/77-Prod. II]

कार्ता. 3138—यत्. केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में व्यघन क्षेत्र के०प्रो०डी०-1 से जी० जी० एस०-VII तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यत्: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पावद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः ; अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्-द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बतते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद् कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बबोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः, यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगतः हो या किसी विधि व्यावसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

व्यघन क्षेत्र के०प्रो०डी०-1 से जी० जी० एस०-VII तक पाइपलाइन
बिछाना

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला तथा तालुकका :	गांधीनगर		
गांव	ब्लाक नं०	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर ए०आर०ई०	सेन्टेयर
1	2	3	4	5
प्रवालज	501	0	06	60
	514	0	03	78
	516	0	19	50
	545	0	14	48
	544	0	24	40
	542	0	24	05
	540	0	10	65
	सर्वेक्षण नं०			
बरामद	957/2	0	05	55
	1006/2	0	09	75
	1006/1	0	11	45
	1008/2	0	06	75
	1005	0	06	45
	1020	0	17	70
	1024	0	15	00
	1028	0	04	05
	1027/1	0	13	25

1	2	3	4	5
	1027/2	0	21	75
	1032	0	01	35
	1037/1	0	10	35
	1034	0	19	05

[सं० 12016/2/77-प्रोडक्शन-II]

S.O. 3138.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D. S. KOD-1 to GGS VII in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission ;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying Pipeline from D.S. KOD-1 to GGS VII.				
State : Gujarat		District & Taluka : Gandhinagar		
Village	Block No.	Area		
		Hectare	Acre	Centiare
Adalaj	501	0	06	60
	514	0	03	78
	516	0	19	50
	545	0	14	48
	544	0	24	40
	542	0	24	05
	540	0	10	65
	Survey No.			
Uvarasad	957/2	0	05	55
	1006/2	0	09	75
	1006/1	0	11	45
	1008/2	0	06	75
	1005	0	06	45
	1020	0	17	70
	1024	0	15	00
	1028	0	04	05
	1027/1	0	13	25
	1027/2	0	21	75
	1032	0	01	35
	1037/1	0	10	35
	1034	0	19	05

[No. 12016/2/77-Prod. III]

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 1977

का० आ० 3139—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप सं० एन०के०ए०के० से डब्ल्यू०एच०आई० कादी-25 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एन०के०ए०के० से एन०के०ए०के० में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग, निर्माण तथा अनुरक्षण प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप सं० एन०के०ए०के० से एन०के०ए०के० से डब्ल्यू०एच०आई० कादी-25 तक पाइपलाइन बिछाना

राज्य: गुजरात	जिला: अहमदाबाद	तालुका: वीरमगम			
गांव	सर्वेक्षण नं०	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टेयर	एकड़	सेण्टीयर
बाजमामन	374/2	0	04	00	
	374/1	0	18	70	
	371/2	0	10	80	
	371/1	0	14	52	
	366/3	0	06	60	
	365/3	0	02	64	
	365/8	0	04	50	
	कार्ट-ट्रेक	0	01	08	
	412/1	0	05	75	
	413	0	14	40	
	414/1	0	17	00	
	410/1	0	06	60	
सुजपुरा तेलाबी	408	0	12	60	
	429	0	10	80	
	80	0	00	84	
	233	0	13	20	
	236/6	0	56	64	
	कार्ट-ट्रेक	0	00	72	
	226/5/9	0	03	24	
	226/5/12	0	03	24	

[सं० 12016/1/77-प्रोडक्शन-I]

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1977

S.O. 3139.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Well No. NKAS to NKAK to NKAG to WH I Kadi-25 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land)

Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying Pipeline from Well No. NKAS to NKAK to NKAG to WHI KADI-25.

State : Gujarat	District : Ahmedabad	Taluka : Viramgam
Village	Survey No.	Area Hectare Are Centiare
Balsasan	374/2	0 04 00
	374/1	0 18 70
	371/2	0 10 80
	371/1	0 14 52
	366/3	0 06 60
	365/3	0 02 64
	365/8	0 04 50
	Cart track	0 01 80
	412/1	0 05 75
	413	0 14 40
	414/1	0 17 00
	410/1	0 06 60
	408	0 12 60
	429	0 10 80
	80	0 00 84
Sujpura Telavi	233	0 13 20
	236/6	0 56 64
	Cart track	0 00 72
	226/5/9	0 03 24
	226/5/12	0 03 24

[No. 12016/1/77-Prod.-I]

का० आ० 3140—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में व्यधन क्षेत्र एन०के०ए०टी० से एन०के०ए०यू० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तैय तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाठ्य अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वशतः कि उक्त भूमि में हितवश कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तैय तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण तथा अनुरक्षण प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यावसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

व्यधन क्षेत्र एन०के०ए०टी० से एन०के०ए०यू० तक पाइपलाइन बिछाना

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : अहमदाबाद	तालुका : वीरमगम
गाँव	सर्वेक्षण नं०	क्षेत्रफल
		हेक्टेयर एघारई सेण्टीयर
सुजपुरा	90	0 08 28
बालसासन	385	0 16 00
	386	0 07 80
	387/2	0 12 22
	388/2	0 05 64
	371/1	0 06 84
	366/3	0 07 20

[सं० 12016/1/77-प्रोडक्शन-II]

S.O. 3140.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D. S. NKAT to NKAU in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying Pipeline from D.S. NKAT to NKAU.

State : Gujarat Dist : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Area Hectare Are Centiare
Sujpura	90	0 08 28
Balsasan	385	0 16 00
	386	0 07 80
	387/2	0 12 22
	388/2	0 05 64
	371/1	0 06 84
	366/3	0 07 20

[No. 12016/1/77-Prod. II]

का०आ० 3141.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० 212 से कूप नं० 135 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तैय तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाठ्य अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः; अब, पेट्रोलियम तथा खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की

उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवक्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आणख्य पक्षद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बनने कि उक्त भूमि में हितवन् कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आशेष मक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण तथा देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वदोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आशेष करने वाला हर व्यक्ति, विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनुवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यावसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं०	212 कूप नं० 135 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाना				
राज्य	गुजरात	जिला	बरोच	तालुका	अंकलेख
गाँव	सर्वेक्षण नं०				क्षेत्रफल
मदकोदरा		हेक्टेयर	ए	आर	ई सेण्टीयर
	79	0	17		55
उमरवाडा	410/3/2	0	21		45

[सं०/2016/3/77-प्रोडक्शन]

S.O. 3141.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Well No. 212 to Well No. 135 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission ;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-9 ;

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Laying Pipeline from Well No. 212 to Well No. 135.

State : Gujarat	Distt : Broach	Taluka : Ankleshwar
Village	Survey No.	Area
		Hectare Arc Centiare
Bhadkodra	79	0 17 55
Umarwada	410/3/2	0 21 45

[No. 12016/3/77-Prod.]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का० आ० 3142:—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के का० आ० सं० 846 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन III दिनांक 23-2-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील देसूरी जिला पाली की उस अधिसूचना से पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 19-3-77 में, पृष्ठ संख्या 1083 से 1087 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962

(1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन-I]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3142.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/3/77-Prod-III dated 23-2-1977 issued under S.O. 846 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 19-3-1977 at page Nos. 1083 to 1087 under Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Desuri District Pali specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/3/77-Prod-I]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का० आ० 3143:—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के का० आ० सं० 845 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन II दिनांक 23-2-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील पिन्डवारा जिला सिरौही की उस अधिसूचना से पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 19-3-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 1076 से 1083 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन-II]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3143.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/3/77-Prod-II dated 23-2-1977 issued under S.O. 845 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 19-3-1977 at page Nos. 1076 to 1083 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Pindwara District Sirohi specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/3/77-Prod-II]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का० आ० 3144:—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के का० आ० सं० 844 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना संख्या 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन I दिनांक 23-2-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील रायपुर जिला पाली की उस अधिसूचना से पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 19-3-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 1067 से 1076 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/3/77-प्रोडक्शन-III]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3143.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/3/77-Prod-I dated 23-2-1977 issued under S.O. 844 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii) dated 19-3-1977 at page Nos. 1067 to 1076 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Raipur District Pali specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/3/77-Prod III]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3145.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 1098 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/15/76-उत्पादन दिनांक 23-3-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील चाकसू जिला जयपुर की उस अधिसूचना से पाबंद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 9-4-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 1308 से 1315 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-I]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3145.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod dated 23-3-1977 issued under S.O. 1098 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii) dated 9-4-1977 at page Nos. 1308 to 1315 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Chaksu District Jaipur specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-I]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3146.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 666 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन दिनांक 31-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील फागी जिला जयपुर की उस अधिसूचना से पाबंद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 26-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 838 से 846 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962, (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-II]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3146.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod, dated 31-1-1977 issued under S.O. 666 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii)

dated 26-2-1977 at page Nos. 838 to 846 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Phagi District Jaipur specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-II]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3147.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 436 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/15/76 प्रोडक्शन III दिनांक 10-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील लागसोट जिला जयपुर की उस अधिसूचना से पाबंद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 5-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 515 से 516 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-III]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3147.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod-III dated 10-1-1977 issued under S.O. 436 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii) dated 5-2-1977 at page Nos. 515 to 516 under Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Lalsot District Jaipur specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-III]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3148.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 437 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना संख्या 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन IV दिनांक 10-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील दोसा जिला जयपुर की उस अधिसूचना से पाबंद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 5-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 516 से 523 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-IV]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3148.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod-IV dated 10-1-1977 issued under S.O. 437 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii) dated 5-2-1977 at page Nos. 516 to 523 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Dausa District Jaipur specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-IV]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3149.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 1397 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन दिनांक 21-4-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील सिकराय जिला जयपुर की उस अधिसूचना से पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 14-5-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 1614 से 1623 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-V]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3149.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod, dated 21-4-1977 issued under S.O. 1397 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section(ii) dated 14-5-1977 at page Nos. 1614 to 1623 under Sub-section(1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Sikrai District Jaipur specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-V]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3150.—भारत सरकार पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 435 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना संख्या 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन II दिनांक 10-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील बस्सी जिला जयपुर, की उस अधिसूचना से पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 5-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 514 से 515 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन-VI]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3150.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod-II dated 10-1-1977 issued under S.O. 435 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 5-2-1977 at page Nos. 514 to 515 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Bassi District Jaipur specified in the scheduled appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-VII]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3151.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 434 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना संख्या 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन I दिनांक 10-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील ब्राह्म रोड जिला सिरोंही की उस अधिसूचना से पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत के 89GI/77—4

राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 5-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 508 से 514 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/15/76-प्रोडक्शन VII]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3151.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/15/76-Prod-I dated 10-1-1977 issued under S.O. 434 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 5-2-1977 at page Nos. 508 to 514 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Abu Road District Sirohi specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/15/76-Prod-VIII]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3152.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 1097 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० 12020/16/76-प्रोडक्शन दिनांक 14-3-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील ब्यावर जिला अजमेर की उस अधिसूचना से पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 9-4-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 1295 से 1308 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/16/76-प्रोडक्शन-I]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3152.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/16/76-Prod dated 14-3-1977 issued under S.O. 1097 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 9-4-1977 at page Nos. 1295 to 1308 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Beawar District Ajmer specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/16/76-Prod-II]

शुद्धि-पत्र

क्र० आ० 3153.—भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के क्र० आ० सं० 660 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना संख्या 12020/16/76-प्रोडक्शन-I दिनांक 28-1-77 जो धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत तहसील बाली जिला पाली की उस अधिसूचना से पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग II-खण्ड 3 उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 26-2-77 में पृष्ठ संख्या 810 से 819 पर प्रकाशित हुई है, के पैरा 3 में "पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्दों के स्थान पर "पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50)" शब्द पढ़े जावेंगे।

[सं० 12020/16/76-प्रोडक्शन-II]

टी० पी० सुब्रह्मनियम, अवर सचिव

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3153.—In para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum, New Delhi Notification No. 12020/16/76-Prod. dated 28-1-1977 issued under S.O. 660 and published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 26-2-1977 at page Nos. 810 to 819 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 for acquisition of right of user in lands of Tehsil Bali District Pali specified in the schedule appended to that Notification, for the words "Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" the words "Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962)" shall be substituted.

[No. 12020/16/76-Prod-II]

T. P. SUBRAHMANYAN, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 सितम्बर, 1977

क्र० आ० 3154.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, औषधि और प्रसाधन सामग्री अधिनियम, 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) और (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय (स्वास्थ्य विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1772, तारीख 26 मई, 1973 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "धारा 5 की उपधारा 2 के खण्ड (10) के अधीन निर्वाचित 'शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

"प्राचार्य हरकिशन सिंह, वैषजिक विज्ञान के विभागाध्यक्ष, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, लण्हीगढ़ की 18 फरवरी, 1977 में औषधि तकनीकी बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में।"

[सं० एम्स 19012/3/76-डी० एण्ड एम० एम०]

आशा शर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 21st September, 1977

S.O. 3154.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of Health) No. S.O. 1772, dated the 26th May, 1973, namely :—

In the said notification under the head "Elected under clause (x) of sub-section 2 of section 5", for the existing entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

"Professor Harkishan Singh, Head of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences Punjab University Chandigarh, as a member of the Drugs Technical Advisory Board, with effect from the 18th February, 1977."

[No. X. 19012/3/76 D&MS]

MRS. ASHA SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 29 सितम्बर, 1977

क्र० आ० 3154.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार दंत चिकित्सा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 16) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (ख) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 23-9-1977 से भारतीय दन्त परिषद् का सदस्य मनोनीत करती है :—

1. डा० जी० आर० भट्ट,
अद्वैतनिक सचिव,
भारतीय दंत चिकित्सा संघ,
15, पूरमवलकाह हाई रोड,
मद्रास-600007

2. डा० फाली मेहता,
अध्यक्ष, दन्त विज्ञान विभाग
डा० एच० भाभा इंस्टीट्यूट आफ फंडामेंटल रिसर्च,
बम्बई
3. डा० पी० पी० ठुकराल,
सह प्रोफेसर और अध्यक्ष दन्त विज्ञान विभाग,
मोलाणा आजाद मेडिकल कॉलेज,
नई दिल्ली

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भूतपूर्व स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार की 17 अक्टूबर, 1962 की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ 3-2/62-एम-2 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :

उक्त अधिसूचना में शीर्षक "धारा 3 के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन मनोनीत के अन्तर्गत" कुल संख्या, 2, 4 और 5 पर दल गठ प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी अर्थात् :—

- "2. डा० पी० पी० ठुकराल,
सह प्रोफेसर और अध्यक्ष, दन्त विज्ञान विभाग,
मोलाणा आजाद मेडिकल कॉलेज,
नई दिल्ली।
4. डा० फाली मेहता,
अध्यक्ष, दन्त विज्ञान विभाग
डा० एच० भाभा इंस्टीट्यूट आफ फंडामेंटल रिसर्च,
बम्बई।
5. डा० जी० आर० भट्ट,
अद्वैतनिक सचिव,
भारतीय दंत चिकित्सा संघ,
15, पूरमवलकाह हाई रोड,
मद्रास-600007

[सं० सी०-12013/2/77-पी० एम० एम०]

विवेक कुमार अग्निहोत्री, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 1977

S.O. 3155.—Whereas the Central Government have, in pursuance of the provisions of clause (f) of section 3 of the Dentists Act, 1948 (16 of 1948) nominated the following persons to be members of the Dental Council of India with effect from 23rd September, 1977 :—

1. Dr. G. R. Bhatt,
Honorary Secretary,
Indian Dental Association,
15, Puraswalakah High Road,
Madras-600007.
2. Dr. Fali Mehta,
Head of the Dentistry Department,
Dr. H. Baba Institute of Fundamental
Research, Bombay.
3. Dr. P. P. Thukral,
Associate Professor & Head of Department
of Dentistry, Maulana Azad Medical College,
New Delhi.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health No. F. 3-2/62-MII, dated the 17th October, 1962, namely:

In the said notification, under the heading "Nominated under clause (f) of section 3," for the entries against serial Nos. 2, 4 and 5, the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"2. Dr. P. P. Thukral,
Associate Professor & Head of the Department
of Dentistry, Maulana Azad Medical College,
New Delhi.

4. Dr. Fali Mehta,
Head of the Dentistry Department,
Dr. H. Baba Institute of Fundamental
Research, Bombay.

5. Dr. G. R. Bhatt,
Honorary Secretary,
Indian Dental Association, Indian Dental Association,
15, Purasawalakah High Road, Madras-600007."

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 21st September, 1977

S.O. 3156.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Coal) No. S.O. 1575, dated the 5th May, 1977, published at pages 1913-1915 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 28th May, 1977, in the English version at page 1915, in the left hand column, in lines 13 and '18' for "69.00 acres".

Read "69.90 acres".

[No. V. 12013/2/77-PMS]

V. K. AGNIHOTRI, Under Secy.

[No. 19(62)/76-C.L]

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 1977

कां०आ० 3157.—केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में कोयला अधिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है।

अतः अब केंद्रीय सरकार, कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अर्थात् आशय की सूचना देती है।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण वेस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) कार्यालय, विवेकर हाउस, टेम्पुल रोड, नागपुर या उपायुक्त कार्यालय, विनामपुर मध्यप्रदेश या कोयला नियंत्रक कार्यालय, 1 फाउन्टैन हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाली भूमि में हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में वर्णित सभी मानचित्र, चार्ट और अन्य दस्तावेज इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से नब्बे दिन के भीतर राजस्व अधिकारी, वेस्टर्न कोल-फील्ड्स लिमिटेड, विवेकर हाउस, टेम्पुल रोड, नागपुर-1 को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची

जटराज ब्लॉक

कोरबा कोल फील्ड

डा सं० डब्ल्यू० सी०एल०/के०बी०/जटराज भूमि/2-77, तारीख 2-6-77

क्र०सं०	ग्राम	तहसील	हल्का सं०	खेती सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पण
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. जेवरग	.	कटघोरा	51	91	विलासपुर	—	भाग
2. नरवाईबाद	.	"	54	90	"	—	"
3. भथिरा	.	"	54	29	"	—	"
4. बरभट्टा	.	"	53	89	"	—	"
5. पंड़िपारण	.	"	53	87	"	—	"
6. सलोरा	.	"	53	88	"	—	"
7. खोडरी	.	"	52	95	"	—	पूर्ण
8. बरपाली	.	"	51	96	"	—	भाग
9. कुर्पा	.	"	51	118	"	—	"
10. रिमदी	.	"	52	94	"	—	"
11. चुरेल	.	"	52	92	"	—	"
12. बुल्लापुर	.	"	51	117	"	—	पूर्ण
13. बरकुटा	.	"	52	116	"	—	"
14. पाली	.	"	52	119	"	—	भाग
15. पर्वनियां	.	"	52	120	"	—	"
16. जटराज यू/एस	.	"	52	यू/एस	"	—	पूर्ण
17. मोनपुरी	.	"	52	115	"	—	भाग
18. खैर भाबना	.	"	52	121	"	—	"

कुल क्षेत्र : 6045.00 एकड़ (लगभग)

या 2446.32 हेक्टर (लगभग)

सीमा-वर्णन

क-ख रेखा ग्राम जेवरग और सलोरी की भागत. सामान्य सीमा के साथ साथ और ग्राम नरवाई और भथिरा से (अर्थात् कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(1) के अधीन कां०आ० सं० 150 तारीख 4-1-64 द्वारा अधिसूचित कुसमुण्डा ब्लॉक की पूर्वी सीमा से, होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

- ख-ग . रेखा ग्राम भथिरा नरैबाद, बरसड़ा, पांडुराणि, सलौरा चुरेल से होकर ग्राम रिसदी, ग्रामगांव की भागत: सामान्य सीमा के साथ साथ और ग्राम रिसदी, पाली, पदनिया, खैर भावता और सोनपुरी से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।
- ग-घ . रेखा ग्राम सोनपुरी, जटराज यू/एस और दुर्पा में हसदी नदी के बायें किनारे के साथ साथ जाता है और बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।
- घ-ङ . रेखा ग्राम दुर्पा से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'ङ' पर मिलती है।
- ङ-च . रेखा ग्राम दुर्पा से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है।
- च-क . रेखा ग्राम दुर्पा, बरपाली और जेवरा से होकर जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19(38)/77-कोयला]

आर० एस० शिवानी, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th September, 1977

S.O. 3157.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein.

The plan of the area covered by this notification can be inspected at the Office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Bisesar House, Temple Road, Nagpur or at the Office of the Collector, Bilaspur (Madhya Pradesh) or at the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta.

All persons interested in the land covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Revenue Officer, Western Coalfields Limited, Bisesar House, Temple Road, Nagpur-1 within ninety days from due date of publication of this notification.

SCHEDULE

Jatraj Block

Korba Coalfield

Drawing No. WCL/KB/Jatraj Land/2-77 Dated : 2-6-1977

Sl. No.	Village	Tahsil	Halka No.	Khewat No.	District	Area	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Geora	Katghora	51	91	Bilaspur	..	Part
2.	Naraibad	"	54	90	"	..	"
3.	Bhathira	"	54	29	"	..	"
4.	Barbhatta	"	53	89	"	..	"
5.	Pandripani	"	53	87	"	..	"
6.	Salora	"	53	88	"	..	"
7.	Khodri	"	52	95	"	..	Full
8.	Barpali	"	51	96	"	..	Part
9.	Durpa	"	51	118	"	..	Part
10.	Risdi	"	52	94	"	..	Part
11.	Churel	"	52	92	"	..	Part
12.	Dullapur	"	51	117	"	..	Full
13.	Barkuta	"	52	116	"	..	Full
14.	Pali	"	52	119	"	..	Part
15.	Padania	"	52	120	"	..	Part
16.	Jatraj U/s.	"	52	U/S	"	..	Full
17.	Sonpuri	"	52	115	"	..	Part
18.	Khairbhaona	"	52	121	"	..	Part

Total Area : 6045.00 acres (approximately)

or

2446.32 hectares (approximately)

Boundary Description :

- A—B** Line passes along with part common boundary of villages Geora and Mangaori and through villages Naraibad and Bhathira, (i.e.) the eastern boundary of Kusmunda Block notified u/s 9(1) of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 vide S.O. No. 150 dated 4-1-1964 and meets at point "B".
- B—C** Line passes through villages Bhathira, Naraibad, Barbhatta, Pandripani, Salora, Churel, along part common boundary of villages Risdi, Amgaon and through villages Risdi, Pali, Padania, Khairbhaona and Sonpuri and meets at point "C".
- C—D** Line passes along the left bank of River Hasdo in villages Sonpuri, Jatraj U/s. and Durpa and meets at Point "D".
- D—E** Line passes through village Durpa and meets at point "E".
- E—F** Line passes through village Durpa and meets at point "F".
- F—A—** Line passes through villages Durpa, Barpali and Geora and meets at starting point at "A".

[File. No. 19(38)/77-C.L.]

R. S. SHIVANI, Dy. Secy.

कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(खाद्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 1977

का० आ० 3158.—फल उत्पाद आदेश, 1955 के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड

(1) (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अनुज्ञापन अधिकारी ने श्री पी० एम० पुनोहित, सचिव, भारतीय खाद्य प्रसंस्करण उद्योग संस्था, 3 सदाशिव स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई 400004 को श्री तबरोज डी० कूका, जिन्होंने त्यागपत्र दे दिया है, के स्थान पर केन्द्रीय फल उत्पाद मलाहकार समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है।

2. खाद्य विभाग से श्री आर० के० शास्त्री, संयुक्त सचिव, जो कि केन्द्रीय फल उत्पाद मलाहकार समिति के पदेन अध्यक्ष थे, के स्थानान्तरण के कारण, श्री कमला प्रसाद, संयुक्त सचिव, खाद्य विभाग, केन्द्रीय फल उत्पाद मलाहकार समिति के पदेन अध्यक्ष बन गए हैं।

अतः फल उत्पाद आदेश, 1955 के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय (खाद्य विभाग) को अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1695, तारीख 26 मार्च, 1976 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

सदस्यों की सूची के नीचे, क्रम संख्या 1 और 7 और उनसे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम सं० और प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

“1. श्री कमला प्रसाद,

संयुक्त सचिव,

खाद्य विभाग,

कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

अध्यक्ष

7. श्री पी० एम० पुनोहित, मुख्य, चटनी और अचारों के सयुक्त सचिव, भारतीय खाद्य प्रसंस्करण उद्योग संस्था

3 सदाशिव स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-400004

[सं० 9/2/75-एफ एम वी० IV]

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE & IRRIGATION

(Department of Food)

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1977

S.O. 3158.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (i) (cc) of clause 3 of the Fruit Products Order, 1955, the Licensing Officer has nominated Shri P. S. Purohit, Secretary, Indian Food Processing Industry Association, 3, Sadashiv Street, Bombay-400004 as a member of the Central Fruit Products Advisory Committee in place of Shri Naoroj D. Kooka who has resigned.

2. With the transfer from the Department of Food of Shri R. K. Shastri, Joint Secretary who was ex-officio Chairman of the Central Fruit Products Advisory Committee, Shri Kamala Prasad, Joint Secretary, Department of Food has become ex-officio Chairman of the Central Fruit Products Advisory Committee.

Therefore, in pursuance of sub-clause (i) of clause 3 of the Fruit Products Order, 1955, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendments to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Food) No. S.O. 1695 dated 26th March, 1976, namely :—

Under the list of members, for serial Nos. 1 and 7 and the entries relating thereto, the following serial Nos. and entries shall be substituted, namely :—

“1. Shri Kamla Prasad, Joint Secretary,
Department of Food, Ministry of
Agriculture and Irrigation.

Chairman

7. Shri P. S. Purohit, Secretary,
Indian Food Processing Industry
Association, 3, Sadashiv Street,
Bombay-400004.

Representative of
small scale manu-
facturers of
murabba, Chutney
and pickles.”

[No. 9/2/75-FNB.IV]

नई दिल्ली 26 सितम्बर, 1977

का० आ० 3159.—केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम, भाण्डागारण निगम अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 58) की धारा 42 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की पूर्ण मंजूरी से, केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (कर्मचारिवृत्त) विनियम, 1966 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित विनियम बनाता है, अर्थात् :—

1 (1) इन विनियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (कर्मचारिवृत्त) संशोधन विनियम, 1977 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (कर्मचारिवृत्त) विनियम, 1966 में, विनियम 15 में,—

(क) उपविनियम (2) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उपविनियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(2) जब तक कि नियोजन के निबन्धनों और शर्तों में अन्यथा अनुबोध न हो, प्रत्येक कर्मचारी नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट दर से, उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट शहर या नगर या क्षेत्र के वर्ग की बाबत, मकान किराया भत्ते या विशेष दूरस्थ भाण्डागार भत्ते का हकदार होगा।

सारणी

शहर या नगर का वर्ग (1)	मकान किराया भत्ता की दर (2)
क—कलकत्ता, मद्रास और हैदराबाद	वेतन का 25%
क—दिल्ली और मुम्बई	वेतन का 30%
ख-1	वेतन का 15%
ख-2	वेतन का 15%
ग	वेतन का 7.50%
अवर्गीकृत शहर/नगर या क्षेत्र	विशेष दूरस्थ भाण्डागार भत्ता वेतन का 7.50%”;

(ख) उपविनियम (2) के नीचे आए हुए टिप्पणी में, मंत्र 2 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित मंत्रें अतः स्थापित की जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

“3. इस विनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ “विशेष दूरस्थ भाण्डागार भत्ता” से ऐसा भत्ता अभिप्रेत है, जिसके लिए अवर्गीकृत शहरों, नगरों या क्षेत्रों में निगम के कर्मचारी, उनके उन शहरों, नगरों या क्षेत्रों में के भाण्डागारों में तैनात किए जाने के कारण, और भत्ता विनिर्दिष्ट उनके लिए होने के कारण हकदार होंगे;

4. इस विनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ वर्ग क, ख 1, ख-2 और ग में शहरों और नगरों के वर्गीकरण का वही अर्थ है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों के लिए, मकान किराया भत्ता के प्रयोजनार्थ, वर्ग क, ख-1, ख-2 और ग में शहरों और नगरों के वर्गीकरण को दिया गया है।”

(ग) स्पष्टीकरण में “विनियम 38” शब्द और श्रृंखला के स्थान पर “विनियम 2 का खण्ड (ठ)” शब्द, कोष्ठक और श्रृंखला रखे जाएंगे।

[फा० सं० 6-12/74-एम० जी०]

टी० आर० परमेश्वर, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1977

S.O. 3159.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 42 of the Warehousing Corporations Act, 1962 (58 of 1962), the Central Warehousing Corporation, with the previous sanction of the Central Government, hereby makes the following regulations further to amend the Central Warehousing Corporation (Staff) Regulations, 1966, namely :—

1. (1) These regulations may be called the Central Warehousing Corporation (Staff) Amendment Regulations, 1977.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Central Warehousing Corporation (Staff) Regulations, 1966, in regulation 15,—

(a) for sub-regulation (2), the following sub-regulation shall be substituted, namely :—

“(2) Unless otherwise stipulated in the terms and conditions of employment, every employee shall be entitled to house rent allowance or special remote warehouse allowance at the rate specified in column (2) of the Table below, in respect of the class of city or town or area specified in the corresponding entry in column (1) of the said Table.

TABLE

Class of city or town	Rate of house rent allowance
1	2
A-Calcutta, Madras, and Hyderabad	25% of pay

1	2
A-Delhi and Bombay	30% of pay
B-1	15% of pay
B-2	15% of pay
C	7½% of pay
Unclassified cities/towns or areas	Special remote warehouse allowance 7½% of pay”

(b) in the Note occurring below sub-regulation (2), after item 2, the following items shall be inserted, namely :—

“3. Special remote warehouse allowance”, for the purpose of this regulation means an allowance which the employees of the Corporation in the unclassified cities towns, or areas would be entitled to, as being specific to them, by reason of their being posted in warehouses in such cities, towns or areas;

4. Classification of cities and towns into classes A, B-1, B-2 and C for the purpose of this regulation has the same meaning as is assigned to the classification of cities and towns into classes A, B-1, B-2 and C made for the purpose of house rent allowance in respect of Central Government employees”;

(c) in the Explanation, for the word and figure “regulation 38”, the words, brackets, letter and figure “clause 1” of regulation 2” shall be substituted.

[F. No. 6-12/74-SG]

T. R. PARAMESWARAN, Dy. Secy.

(कृषि विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 सितम्बर, 1977

क्र० आ० 3160.—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उपनियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के कृषि और सिंचाई मन्त्रालय (कृषि विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या क्र० आ० 4105, तारीख 27 मई, 1976 को अधिष्ठात करने हुए यह निदेश देने हैं कि इससे उपाज्य अनुसूची के भाग 1 और भाग 2 के स्तम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट क्रमशः साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह 'ग' और साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह 'घ' के पदों की बाबत स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी होंगे और स्तम्भ (3) और (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट शक्तियों की बाबत क्रमशः अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी और अपील प्राधिकारी होंगे।

वन अनुसंधान संस्थान तथा महाविद्यालय और कोयम्बटूर/बंगलौर/दुमियांग/ब्रह्मपुर/बर्नीहाट/बन्नापुर/हैदराबाद/शिलांग/रांची/शिमला स्थित अन्यत्रिक इकाइयों के संबंध में, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के अधीन पदों का वर्णन नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी, अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी, वे शास्तियाँ, जो अधिरोपित की जा सकेंगी, और अपील प्राधिकारी को दक्षित करने वाली अनुसूची।

पद का नाम	नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी	शास्तियाँ अधिरोपित करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी और वे शास्तियाँ जो वह (नियम 2 में भद्र संख्या के प्रतिनिर्देश से) अधिरोपित कर सकेंगी	अपील प्राधिकारी
1	2	3	4
5	भाग 1, साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह 'ग'		
वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून	उच्च श्रेणी निपिक और अनुसंधान महायक श्रेणी II के रेट तक के पद	रजिस्ट्रार, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय	सभी अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय
		निदेशक, वन शिक्षा/निदेशक वन उत्पाद अनुसंधान/निदेशक वन अनुसंधान/निदेशक वन	(i) में (ii) अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महा-

1	2	3	4	5
		विद्या अनुसंधान/प्रधानाचार्य, उत्तरी वन रेंजर महा विद्यालय/संकायाध्यक्ष भारतीय वन महाविद्यालय/किसी शाखा का भारसाधक ज्येष्ठ अनुसंधान अधिकारी या समतुल्य या उच्च प्राप्ति का अन्य अधिकारी		विद्यालय
अन्य सभी पद	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्या- लय	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय सभी		वन महा निरीक्षक और पदेन अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार, कृषि और मिर्चाई मंत्रालय (कृषि विभाग)
दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय और अनुसंधान केन्द्र, कोयम्बटूर				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान, जैव अनुसंधान, दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय और अनुसंधान केन्द्र, कोयम्बटूर	प्रधानाचार्य और जैव अनुसंधान का प्रधान, सभी दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय और अनुसंधान केन्द्र, कोयम्बटूर		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कुसियांग				
उच्च श्रेणी लिपिक और अनुसंधान सहायक वर्ग 2 के ग्रेड तक के पद	प्रधानाचार्य, पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कुसियांग	प्रधानाचार्य, पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, सभी कुसियांग		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
अन्य सभी पद	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान और महाविद्यालय	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान और महाविद्यालय सभी		वन महानिरीक्षक और पदेन अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार, कृषि और मिर्चाई मंत्रालय (कृषि विभाग)
वन अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, बंगलौर				
सभी पद	उपयोग अनुसंधान का प्रधान, वन अनुसंधान प्रयोग- शाला, बंगलौर	उपयोग अनुसंधान का प्रधान, वन अनुसंधान सभी प्रयोगशाला, बंगलौर		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय
प्रादेशिक वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर				
उच्च श्रेणी लिपिक और अनुसंधान सहायक वर्ग 2 के ग्रेड तक के पद	ज्येष्ठ भारसाधक अनुसंधान अधिकारी, प्रादेशिक वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर	ज्येष्ठ भारसाधक अनुसंधान अधिकारी, प्रादेशिक सभी वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय
अन्य सभी पद	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्या- लय	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय सभी		वन महानिरीक्षक और पदेन अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार, कृषि और मिर्चाई मंत्रालय (कृषि विभाग)
राज्य वन सेवा महाविद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान, राज्य वन सेवा महा- विद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान, राज्य वन सेवा महा- सभी विद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
यूकिलिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, हैदराबाद				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, यूकिलिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, हैदराबाद	समन्वयकर्ता, यूकिलिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, सभी हैदराबाद		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
बीज बैंक और बीज सुधार और वृक्ष प्रजनन केन्द्र, हैदराबाद				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, वृक्ष प्रजनन स्कीम, हैदराबाद	समन्वयकर्ता, वृक्ष प्रजनन स्कीम, हैदराबाद सभी		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
ओलियोरेजिन के अर्धित उत्पादन में अनुसंधान और पाइलट निदर्शन, शिलांग				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, ओलियोरेजिन स्कीम, शिलांग	समन्वयकर्ता, ओलियोरेजिन स्कीम, शिलांग सभी		अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून

1	2	3	4	5
वन की जातियों के संयोजन के साथ नए काटे गए वन-क्षेत्रों में नकदी फसल उगाने के अनुसंधान और प्रदर्शन की पाइलट स्कीम, रांची				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, नकदी फसल स्कीम, रांची	समन्वयकर्ता, नकदी फसल स्कीम, रांची	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
चन्दन कृष्ण अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, चन्दन कृष्ण अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर	समन्वयकर्ता, चन्दन कृष्ण अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
केन्द्रीय वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, चन्द्रपुर				
उच्च श्रेणी लिपिक और अनुसंधान सहायक वर्ग 2 के क्षेत्रों तक के पद	प्रधानाचार्य, केन्द्रीय रेंजर महाविद्यालय, चन्द्रपुर	प्रधानाचार्य, केन्द्रीय महाविद्यालय, चन्द्रपुर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
अन्य सभी पद	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून	सभी	वन महानिरीक्षक एवं पदेन अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार, कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय (कृषि विभाग)
उच्चतर शंकु वृक्ष पुनर्जनन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, शिमला				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, उच्चतर शंकु वृक्ष पुनर्जनन केन्द्र, शिमला	समन्वयकर्ता, शंकु वृक्ष पुनर्जनन केन्द्र, शिमला	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून

भाग 2, माध्यामिक केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह 'घ'

वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून				
सभी पद	उप कुल सचिव, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून	उप कुल सचिव, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
		निदेशक, वन शिक्षा/निदेशक वन उत्पाद अनुसंधान/निदेशक जैव अनुसंधान/निदेशक वन विद्या अनुसंधान/प्रधानाचार्य उत्तरी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय/संकायाध्यक्ष भारतीय वन महाविद्यालय/किसी शाखा का भारसाधक समतुल्य प्राम्थिक का ज्येष्ठ अनुसंधान अधिकारी		(i) से (ii) अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय और अनुसंधान केन्द्र, कोयम्बटूर				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान जैव अनुसंधान, दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कोयम्बटूर	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान जैव अनुसंधान, दक्षिणी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कोयम्बटूर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कुमियांग				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य, पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कुमियांग	प्रधानाचार्य, पूर्वी वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, कुमियांग	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
वन अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, बंगलौर				
सभी	प्रधान, उपयोग अनुसंधान, वन अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, बंगलौर	प्रधान, उपयोग अनुसंधान, वन अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, बंगलौर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
प्रादेशिक वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर				
सभी पद	ज्येष्ठ भारसाधक अनुसंधान अधिकारी, प्रादेशिक वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर	ज्येष्ठ भारसाधक अनुसंधान अधिकारी, प्रादेशिक वन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, जबलपुर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून

1	2	3	4	5
भाग 2, माधाराण केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह 'घ' (जागी)				
राज्य वन सेवा महाविद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान अनुसंधान, राज्य वन सेवा महाविद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट	प्रधानाचार्य और प्रधान अनुसंधान, राज्य वन सेवा महाविद्यालय-एवं-अनुसंधान केन्द्र, वर्नीहाट	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
यूक्लिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, हैदराबाद				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, यूक्लिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, हैदराबाद	समन्वयकर्ता, यूक्लिप्टस अनुसंधान केन्द्र, हैदराबाद	सभी	वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
बीज बैंक और बीज विकास और वृक्ष प्रजनन केन्द्र, हैदराबाद				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, वृक्ष प्रजनन स्कीम, हैदराबाद	समन्वयकर्ता, वृक्ष प्रजनन स्कीम, हैदराबाद	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
श्रीलियोरेजिन के वधित उत्पादन में अनुसंधान और पाइलट निवर्णन, शिलांग				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, श्रीलियोरेजिन स्कीम, शिलांग	समन्वयकर्ता, श्रीलियोरेजिन स्कीम, शिलांग	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
वन की जातियों के संयोजन के नए काटे गए वन-वृक्षों में नगदी फसल उगाने के अनुसंधान और प्रदर्शन की पाइलट स्कीम, रांची				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, नगदी फसल स्कीम, रांची	समन्वयकर्ता, नगदी फसल स्कीम, रांची	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
अम्बन कणिश अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, अम्बन कणिश अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर	समन्वयकर्ता, अम्बन कणिश अनुसंधान केन्द्र, बंगलौर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
केन्द्रीय वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, चम्पूर				
सभी पद	प्रधानाचार्य, केन्द्रीय वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, चम्पूर	प्रधानाचार्य, केन्द्रीय वन रेंजर महाविद्यालय, चम्पूर	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून
उच्चतर शंकुवृक्ष पुनर्जनन अनुसंधान केन्द्र, शिमला				
सभी पद	समन्वयकर्ता, उच्च स्तर शंकु वृक्ष पुनर्जनन केन्द्र, शिमला	समन्वयकर्ता, उच्च स्तर शंकु वृक्ष पुनर्जनन केन्द्र, शिमला	सभी	अध्यक्ष, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान और महाविद्यालय, देहरादून

[सं० जी० 11025/23/74-एफ० आर० बाई०-एफ०]

बी० कोहली, प्रवर सचिव

(Department of Agriculture)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1977

S.O. 3160.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965 and in supersession of the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 4105, dated the 27th May, 1976, the President hereby directs that in respect of the posts in the General Central Service, Group C, and the General Central Service, Group D, specified in column (1) of Part I and Part II respectively of the Schedule hereto annexed, the authority specified in the column (2) shall be the appointing authority and the authorities specified in columns (3) and (5) shall be the disciplinary authority and appellate authority respectively in regard to the penalties specified in column (4).

SCHEDULE SHOWING DESCRIPTION OF POSTS, APPOINTING AUTHORITY, DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY, PENALTIES WHICH MAY BE IMPOSED AND APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE CENTRAL CIVIL SERVICES (CLASSIFICATION, CONTROL AND APPEAL) RULES, 1965 RELATING TO FOREST RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND COLLEGES AND ITS OUT-STATION UNITS AT COIMBATORE/BANGALORE/KURSEONG/JABALPUR/BURNIHAT/CHANDRAPUR/HYDERABAD/SHILLONG/RANCHI/SIMLA.

Description of post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item number in rule II)		Appellate authority
		Authority	Penalties	
1	2	3	4	5
PART I—GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICE, GROUP 'C'				
FOREST RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND COLLEGES, DEHRA DUN.				
Posts upto the grade of Upper Division Clerk and Research Assistant, Grade II.	Registrar, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	Registrar, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.
		Director of Forest Education/Director of Forest Products Research/Director of Biological Research/Directors of Forestry Research/Principal, Northern Forest Rangers College/Dean, Indian Forest College/Senior Research Officers or other officers of equivalent or higher status incharge of a Branch.	(i) to (iv)	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.
All other posts.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	All	Inspector General of Forests and Ex-officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agriculture).
SOUTHERN FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE AND RESEARCH CENTRE, COIMBATORE.				
All posts.	Principal and Head of Biological Research Southern Forest Rangers College and Research Centre, Coimbatore.	Principal and Head of Biological Research Southern Forest Rangers College and Research Centre, Coimbatore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
EASTERN FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE, KURSEONG.				
Posts upto the grade of Upper Division Clerk and Research Assistant, Grade II.	Principal, Eastern Forest Rangers College, Kurseong	Principal, Eastern Forest Rangers College, Kurseong.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
All other posts.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	All	Inspector General of Forests and Ex-officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agriculture).
FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY, BANGALORE.				
All posts.	Head of Utilisation Research, Forest Research Laboratory, Bangalore.	Head of Utilisation Research, Forest Research Laboratory, Bangalore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.

1	2	3	4	5
REGIONAL FOREST RESEARCH CENTRE, JABALPUR.				
Posts upto the grade of Upper Division Clerk and Research Assistant, Grade II.	Senior Research Officer-in-Charge, Regional Forest Research Centre, Jabalpur.	Senior Research Officer-in-Charge, Regional Forest Research Centre, Jabalpur.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.
All other posts.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges.	All	Inspector General of Forests and Ex-officio additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agriculture).
STATE FOREST SERVICE COLLEGE-CUM-RESEARCH CENTRE, BURNIHAT.				
All posts.	Principal and Head of State Forest Service College-cum-Research Centre, Burnihat.	Principal and Head of State Forest Service College-cum-Research Centre, Burnihat.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges Dehra Dun.
EUCALYPTUS RESEARCH CENTRE, HYDERABAD.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Eucalyptus Research Centre, Hyderabad.	Coordinator, Eucalyptus Research Centre, Hyderabad.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
SEED BANK AND SEED IMPROVEMENT AND TREE BREEDING CENTRE, HYDERABAD.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Tree Breeding Scheme, Hyderabad.	Coordinator Tree Breeding Scheme, Hyderabad.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
RESEARCH AND PILOT DEMONSTRATION IN INCREASED PRODUCTION OF OLEORESIN, SHILLONG.				
All posts.	Coordinator Oleoresin scheme, Shillong.	Coordinator Oleoresin Scheme, Shillong.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
PILOT SCHEME FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION IN GROWING CASH CROPS IN NEWLY FELLED FOREST AREAS IN CONJUNCTION WITH FOREST SPECIES. RANCHI.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Cash Crop Scheme, Ranchi.	Coordinator, Cash Crop Scheme, Ranchi.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
SANDAL SPIKE RESEARCH CENTRE, BANGALORE.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Sandal Spike Research Centre, Bangalore	Coordinator, Sandal Spike Research Centre, Bangalore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
CENTRAL FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE, CHANDRAPUR.				
Posts upto the grades of Upper Division Clerk and Research Assistant Grade II.	Principal, Central Forest Rangers College, Chandrapur.	Principal, Central Forest Rangers College, Chandrapur.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
All other posts.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.	All	Inspector General of Forests and Ex-officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agriculture).

1	2	3	4	5
HIGH LEVEL CONIFERS REGENERATION RESEARCH CENTRE, SIMLA				
All posts.	Coordinator, High Level Conifers Regeneration Centre, Simla.	Coordinator, High Level Conifers Regeneration Centre, Simla.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
PART II—GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICE, GROUP 'D'				
FOREST RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND COLLEGES, DEHRA DUN.				
All posts	Deputy Registrar, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.	Deputy Registrar, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
		Director of Forest Education/Director of Forest Products Research/Director of Biological Research/Director of Forestry Research/Principal, Northern Forest Rangers College/Dean, Indian Forest College/Senior Research Officers of equivalent status in-charge of a Branch.	(i) to (iv)	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
SOUTHERN FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE AND RESEARCH CENTRE, COIMBATORE.				
All posts.	Principal and Head of Biological Research, Southern Forest Rangers College, Coimbatore.	Principal and Head of Biological Research, Southern Forest Rangers College, Coimbatore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
EASTERN FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE, KURSEONG.				
All posts.	Principal, Eastern Forest Rangers College, Kurseong	Principal, Eastern Forest Rangers College, Kurseong.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY, BANGALORE.				
All posts.	Head of Utilisation Research, Forest Research Laboratory, Bangalore.	Head of Utilisation Research, Forest Research, Laboratory, Bangalore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
REGIONAL FOREST RESEARCH CENTRE, JABALPUR.				
All posts.	Senior Research Officer-in-Charge, Regional Forest Research Centre, Jabalpur.	Senior Research Officer-in-Charge, Regional Forest Research Centre, Jabalpur.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
STATE FOREST SERVICE COLLEGE-CUM-RESEARCH CENTRE, BURNIHAT.				
All posts.	Principal and Head of Research, State Forest Service College-cum-Research Centre, Burnihat.	Principal and Head of Research, State Forest Service College-cum-Research Centre, Burnihat.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
EUCALYPTUS RESEARCH CENTRE, HYDERABAD.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Eucalyptus Research Centre, Hyderabad.	Coordinator, Eucalyptus Research Centre, Hyderabad.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.

1	2	3	4	5
SEED BANK AND SEED IMPROVEMENT AND TREE BREEDING CENTRE, HYDERABAD.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Tree Breeding Scheme, Hyderabad.	Coordinator, Tree Breeding Scheme, Hyderabad.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
RESEARCH AND PILOT DEMONSTRATION IN INCREASED PRODUCTION OF OLEORESIN, SHILLONG.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Oleoresin Scheme, Shillong.	Coordinator, Oleoresin Scheme, Shillong.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
PILOT SCHEME FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION IN GROWING CASH CROPS IN NEWLY FELLED FOREST AREAS IN CONJUNCTION WITH FOREST SPECIES, RANCHI.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Cash Crop Scheme, Ranchi.	Coordinator, Cash Crop Scheme, Ranchi.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
SANDAL SPIKE RESEARCH CENTRE, BANGALORE.				
All posts.	Coordinator, Sandal Spike Research Centre, Bangalore.	Coordinator, Sandal Spike Research Centre, Bangalore.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
CENTRAL FOREST RANGERS COLLEGE, CHANDRAPUR.				
All posts.	Principal, Central Forest Rangers College, Chandrapur.	Principal, Central Forest Rangers College, Chandrapur.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.
HIGH LEVEL CONIFERS REGENERATION RESEARCH CENTRE, SIMLA.				
All posts.	Coordinator, High Level Conifers Regeneration Centre, Simla.	Coordinator, High Level Conifers Regeneration Centre, Simla.	All	President, Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun.

[No. G. 11025/23/74-FRY-F]
V. KOHLI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 1977

New Delhi, the 29th September, 1977

क्रा० भा० 3161.—केन्द्रीय सरकार बीज अधिनियम, 1966 (1966 का 54) की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय बीज समिति से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् अपनी यह राय होने पर कि कृषि के प्रयोजनों के लिए बेचे जाने वाले, नौसे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट बीजों के प्रकार की ब्यालिटि का, स्तम्भ (2) में तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट उनकी किस्म की बाबत विनियमन करना आवश्यक और समीचीन है, घोषणा करती है कि बीजों की उक्त किस्में उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (3) में तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट क्षेत्रों की बाबत, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए अधिसूचित किस्में होंगी।

सारणी

बीज का प्रकार	बीज की किस्में	क्षेत्र जिसके लिए अधिसूचित की गई है
1	2	3
गेहूं जौ राया	डब्ल्यू एल-711 डी एल-70 आर० एम० एल०-198	पंजाब

[संख्या 7-30/75-एम० डी०]

मुनीश अहूजा, उप सचिव

TABLE

Kinds of seed	Varieties of seed	Area for which notified
1	2	3
Wheat Barley Raya	WL-711 DL-70 RLM-198	Punjab

[No. 7-30/75-SD]
SUNIL AHUJA, Dy. Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 1977

का० अ० 3162.—राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियम के नियम 45 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन दिल्ली में साधारण पूल संशोधन नियम, 1977 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख की प्रवृत्त होंगी।

2. सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन दिल्ली में साधारण पूल नियम, 1963 में मद म० (9) के सामान्य अनुसूचक नियम 317-ब-11 के नीचे, सारणी में, स्तम्भ 2 में वर्तमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“सेवा-निवृत्ति से पूर्व छुट्टी की दशा में, अधिकतम 180 दिन की और अन्य वशाओं में चार मास तक की, जिसमें सेवा-निवृत्ति की दशा में अनुश्रेय अवधि भी सम्मिलित है, पूरे औसत वेतन पर छुट्टी की सम्पूर्ण अवधि के लिए।”

[फाइल सं० 12033(4)/77-न० 2]

मीर नसरुल्लाह, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1977

S.O. 3162.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Amendment Rules, 1977.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, in the Table below Supplementary Rule 317-B-11, against item no. (ix), for the existing entry in column 2, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“For the full period of leave on full average pay, subject to a maximum of 180 days in the case of leave preparatory to retirement and 4 months in other cases, inclusive of the period permissible in the case of retirement.”

[File No. 12033(4)/77-Policy Cell II]

MIR NASRULLAH, Jt. Secy.

अभ्य संञ्चालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 सितम्बर, 1977

का० अ० 3163.—मैसर्स राजाराम बन्देकर के प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व गोवा माइनिंग लेबर वेलफेयर यूनियन, अस्सोनोरा, बारडोज गोवा करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मचारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (i) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद का उभयपक्षीय व्यक्ति के माध्यम से निर्वहण करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यम से करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यम से करार को प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री बी० एच० राय ऐंगल,
कामिक प्रबन्धक,
मैसर्स राजाराम बन्देकर (श्रीगाम्रो)
माइन्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,
वासको-डे-गामा, गोवा।

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला : श्री जार्ज वज,
महा सचिव,
गोवा माइनिंग लेबर वेलफेयर
यूनियन, अस्सोनोरा, बारडोज,
गोवा।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री आर० वी० कोलासी, माननीय औद्योगिक अधिकरण, गोवा, दमन और दीव के माध्यम से निर्वहण करने का करार किया गया है :

(i) विनिर्दिष्ट विवादग्रस्त विषय :

1. क्या प्रबन्धन का डा० रमेश जोशी और कम्पाउण्डर श्री नागरेव चन्द गोणकर की सेवा समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो ये व्यक्ति किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

2. क्या संघ की श्री निकोलमनोरोनुहा, श्री फ्रांसिस डी'सौजा, श्री फ्रांसिस डी'मिल्हा और श्री नामदेव गोणकर, शिक्षकों को नौकरी में लगाने की मांग वैध और न्यायोचित है ? यदि हाँ, तो वे किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

3. क्या प्रबन्धन की श्री सुकुन्द बीकेयर कोलेकर, श्री गम्भ बासु शिगादे और श्री वामन मंजरेकर की सेवा समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

(ii) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, जिसमें संबंधित स्थापना या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है :

मैसर्स राजाराम बन्देकर (श्रीगाम्रो)
माइन्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, पोस्ट वाक्स नं० 31,
वासकोमा, गोवा।

(iii) यदि कोई संघ प्रस्तुत कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो उसका नाम :

गोवा माइनिंग लेबर वेलफेयर यूनियन,
अस्सोनोरा, बारडोज, गोवा।

(i) रजिस्टर उद्गम में विनिर्दिष्ट कर्मचारों की कुल संख्या :

138

(v) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या सम्भावित प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मचारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या :

8

मध्यस्थ का निर्णय हम पर बाबंदकर होगा।

मध्यस्थ धारा 10-क के अधीन निर्दिष्ट करने की तारीख से अपना पंचाट तीन मास की कालावधि या उभयपक्षों और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा। यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता तो माध्यम से निर्वहण

स्वतः रह जायगा और हम नए माध्यस्थ्य के लिए बातचीत करने का स्वतंत्र होंगे।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर :

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

ह/-

(बी० एच० पाई एंगल)

कामिक प्रबन्धक

मैसर्स राजाराम बन्देकर (श्रीगाओ)

माइन्स प्रा० लिमिटेड, वास्को-डे-गामा।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

ह/-

(जार्ज वज)

महा सचिव,

गोवा माइनिंग लेबर वेल्फेयर

यूनियन, अस्सोनोरा, बारदेज,

गोवा।

साक्षी :

1. ह/- अपाट्य

2. ह/- अपाट्य

[सम्ख्या एल-29012/21/77-डी-3 (बी)]

सी० आर० निम, व्यव सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1977

S.O. 3163.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Rajaram Bandekar and their workmen represented by Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union, Assonora, Bardez, Goa;

And whereas the said management and their workmen have by a written agreement in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (i) of section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) agreed to refer to the said dispute to arbitration of the person mentioned therein and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (3) of the section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement.

(AGREEMENT)

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of Parties :

Representing employers : Mr. V. H. Pai Angle,
Personnel Manager,
M/s. Rajaram Bandekar (Sirigao)
Mines Private Limited,
Vasco-da-Gama, Goa.

Representing workmen : Mr. George Vaz,
General Secretary,
Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union,
Assonora, Bardez, Goa.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of

Shri R. V. Kollali,
Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal,
Goa, Daman & Diu.

(i) Specific matters in dispute :—

- Whether the action of the management in terminating the services of Dr. Ramesh Joshi and Compunder Shri Namdev Chandu Gaonkar is legal and justified? If not, to what relief these persons are entitled?

2. Whether the demand of the Union for employment of apprentices Shri Nicholas Noronha, Shri Francis D'Suza, Shri Francis D' Silva and Shri Narnedo Gaonkar is legal and justified? If so, to what relief they are entitled?

3. Whether the action of the management in terminating the services of Shri Mukund Bicare Coulekar, Shri Shambu Bosu Shingade and Shri Waman Manjrekar is legal and justified. If not, to what relief these workers are entitled?

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved :

M/s. Rajaram Bandekar (Sirigao) Mines Pvt. Ltd.,
Post Box No. 31, Vasco-da-gama, Goa.

(iii) Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question :

Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union,
Assonora, Bardez, Goa.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected :

138

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute :-

8

The decision of the Arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of three months from the date of reference under Section 10-A or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Sd/-

Signature of the parties : (V. H. Pai Angle)

Representing employers : Personnel Manager,
M/s. Rajaram Bandekar (Sirigao)
Mines Pvt. Ltd.
Vasco-da-Gama.

Representing workmen : (George Vaz)
General Secretary,
Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union,
Assonora, Bardez, Goa.

Witness :

1. Sd/- Illegible.

2. Sd/- Illegible.

[No. L-29012/21/77-D. III.B.]

C. R. NIM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 1977

का० अ० 3164.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, मजदूरी संदाय अधिनियम, 1936 (1936 का 4) की धारा 24 के साथ पठित धारा 7 की उप धारा (2) के खण्ड (ज) के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० ग्रा० 317/पी डब्लू ए/अनु 7(2)(ज)/64 तारीख 17 जनवरी, 1964 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, 'रेलवे', शब्द के पश्चात् "वायु परिवहन सेवाएं" शब्द अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[सं० एस-31014 (18), 76-डब्ल्यू० सी० (पी० डब्ल्यू०)]

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1977

S.O. 3164.—In pursuance of clause (i) of sub-section (2) of section 7, read with section 24, of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Govern-

ment of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S. O. 317/PWA/Sec. 7(2) (j)/64, dated the 17th January 1964, namely :—

In the said notification, after the word "railway", the words "air transport services" shall be inserted.

[No. S-31014(18)/76-WC(PW)]

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1977

का० अा० 3165.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, मजदूरी संवाय अधिनियम, 1936 (1936 का 4) की धारा 24 के साथ पठित धारा 7 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) और (ख) द्वारा प्रस्तुत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नई दिल्ली के मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) को, रेल, वायु-परिवहन सेवा, खान और तेलक्षेत्र (आयलफील्ड) की बाबत नियोजक द्वारा प्रदत्त सुख सुविधाओं और सेवाओं के लिए कटौतियाँ प्राधिकृत करने तथा अधिनियम के उपरोक्त उपबन्ध के अधीन कापरेटिव सोसाइटियों को किए गए संवायों की कटौतियों का अनुमोदन करने के लिए, अधिकारी के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[संख्या एस-31012(11)/76-इल्यु० सी० (पी० डब्ल्यू०)]

हंस राज छाबड़ा, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st October, 1977

S.O. 3165.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) and (j) of sub-section (2) of section 7, read with section 24, of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), the Central Government hereby specifies the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, as the Officer to authorise deductions for the amenities and services supplied by the employer and to approve deductions for payments to co-operative societies under the above said provision of the Act, in relation to railways, air transport services, mines and oilfields.

[No. S-31012(11)/76-WC(PW)]

HANS RAJ CHHABRA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1977

S.O. 3166.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Colliery of M/s T.I.S. Co. Ltd., P.O. Jamadoba, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 3) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 9 of 1977

(Old Ref. No. 19 of 1975)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 10th September, 1977

AWARD

This is a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour under Order No. L-2012/124/74-LRII, dated, the 26th February, 1975. The dispute relates to the retirement of Shri Parmeshwar Mistry, Blacksmith in 6 & 7 Pits, Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. The schedule of reference is as follows :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of 6 and 7 Pits of Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad are justified in retiring Shri Parmeshwar Mistry, Blacksmith, with effect from 1st January, 1974 without sufficient proof that the workman has reached the age of 60 years ? If not to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date ?

2. The concerned workman raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) by means of a letter dated 9-7-1974 alleging therein that his services had been illegally terminated with effect from 1-1-1974.

3. It appears that the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) discussed the matter in conciliation with the parties and as no settlement could be arrived at he submitted a failure report by his letter dated 21-9-1974 and thereafter the present reference was made.

4. On behalf of the management a written statement has been filed contending inter alia that it being an individual dispute it is out side the scope of Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act). It being neither a discharge nor a dismissal nor termination of service in any way whatsoever but it being a question of retirement as per condition of his service Section 2-A of the Act is not attracted and the reference is incompetent.

5. It is said that Parmeshwar Mistry was appointed as Blacksmith with effect from 1-1-48 when on his own declaration his date of birth in his service card was recorded as 1-1-1913. In 1953 a general circular was issued giving opportunity to all workmen to rectify the date of birth if there was any discrepancy and he did not point out any discrepancy and thus tacitly admitted his date of birth as noted in his service card. In 1959 identity card was issued to him in which the same date of birth was embossed and every year bonus card giving his date of birth was issued. But never he had raised any dispute regarding the same.

6. As per above date of birth he was scheduled to retire on 1-1-73 after completing 60 years of age as per condition of service rules of the Company and he was given extension for one year on the report of a Medical Board which found him fit and thus his service was extended upto 1-1-74 on which date he automatically stood retired.

7. Case further is that by an application dated 21-11-73 addressed to the Divisional Manager (Collieries) he requested for extension of his service for two years with effect from 2-1-74 on the ground that he was to get his two daughters married. He was informed by a letter dated 20/21-12-1973 that under the rules no further extension was admissible.

8. It is contended that it was about 6 months after his retirement that in June, 1974 he for the first time alleged about his premature retirement. But from the records and also from his over conducts it was clearly established that he had attained the age of superannuation, namely 60 years on 1-1-1973, and the management is, therefore, justified in retiring him and he is entitled to no relief.

9. There is a written statement on behalf of the workmen wherein it is said that under Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme he had to make a declaration in the prescribed Form wherein as on 22-4-1949 his age was recorded as approximately 25 years, which meant that he was born some time in April, 1924 and therefore in fact he was retired prematurely by about 10 years and the action of the management is not justified. It is said that the declaration which was submitted to the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner under the signature of the then Colliery Manager was in a statutory form and thereafter he was medically examined for ascertainment of his age and then declaration was filed by the management and forwarded by the Manager of the Colliery. This declaration in the statutory form maintained by the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner will prevail over the record kept by the Company relating to his age which are not maintained under the statutory requirement either under the certified Standing Orders or under any other law or rules.

10. It is said further that it was under the Gratuity rules framed by the Company that the services of a time rated workman could be terminated on his attaining the age of

60 years and it was under the Gratuity rules that he was retired after having been given one extension as recommended by the Medical Board. This Board merely ascertained his fitness to continue in the service for a period of one year more and did not ascertain his age. It is only on the basis of unilateral and unscientifically recorded date of birth that his services were terminated with effect from 1-1-74 and the statutory record of provident fund was not taken into consideration.

11. Accordingly it is said that this retirement on the ground of attaining the age of 60 years is not based on any authenticated record and, therefore, it is incorrect and unjustified.

12. Along with the written statement there is a rejoinder on behalf of the workman in which those facts which had been stated in the written statement have been reiterated. It is also said therein that it was not the condition of his service in the absence of provision of the Standing Orders or even otherwise that he could be retired by the Company on attaining the age of 60 years. This termination amounts to discharge and, therefore, is covered under Section 2A of the Act.

13. It is further said that the employers had admitted in course of inter-departmental correspondence, in the letter addressed to the Manager, 6 & 7 Pits Colliery on 24/25-6-74, that there was some dispute or discrepancy regarding the workman's age and that the matter was pending with the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner for disposal. The Manager was requested by that very letter to advise the workman to submit a certificate duly signed by the Colliery Doctor about his age because the date of birth as shown was 1-1-1913 whereas he was below 50 years on 1-1-73 according to the declaration in Form A. It means that there was some doubt about his date of birth and in that view of the matter the management was not justified to retire him from 1-1-74.

14. It is further contended that if the workman did not point out any discrepancy in 1953 that does not render a non-statutory and unilateral record as binding on the workman in the face of statutory record maintained by the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner.

15. There is a rejoinder on behalf of the management as well. It is said therein that the age given in Form A for the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner's record has no concern with the age recorded in the service card of the workman based on his own declaration. He having full knowledge of the age recorded in the service card if he did not make any protest of any kind at any time before June, 1974, it means that he accepted the age mentioned in the record and did not attach any importance to the declaration in the Form A.

16. In support of the case of the workman no witness has been examined and he has not examined himself as well. A few letters have been marked on his behalf which are Exts. W-1 to W-7. Ext. W-8 is the postal acknowledgement card and Ext. W-9 is the postal receipt. Ext. W-10 is the Form A under the Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme.

17. On behalf of the management two witnesses have been examined and reliance has been placed on the documents that have been produced by the management and marked as Exhibits on behalf of the workman.

18. From the facts mentioned in the written statements and rejoinders of the parties the following points are deducible, namely :—

- (1) That as per records of the Company the date of birth of the concerned workman is 1-1-1913.
- (2) That in 1953 all the workmen of the Company were given an opportunity to rectify the mistake if any in the date of birth but nothing was done by the concerned workman.
- (3) That in 1959 identity card was issued to him in which the same date of birth was noted but he did not raise any objection.
- (4) That he was asked to appear before the Medical Board for extension of his service by one year and he was examined on 27-7-72 and his service was

extended for one year as he was found fit. At that time also he did not raise any objection that his date of birth was wrongly recorded.

- (5) That when he applied to the company on 21-11-73 to extend his service for two years more with effect from 2-1-74 he did not whisper that his date of birth as recorded in service card was wrong, rather, requested for extension for two years only on the ground of his daughter's marriage.
- (6) That when he received the reply of refusal he did not raise any objection even then.
- (7) That in Form A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme he made a declaration which was certified by the Manager of the Colliery and therein as on 22nd April 1949 his age was recorded as approximately 25 years which means that he was born sometime in April, 1924.
- (8) That when he applied for refund of his provident fund some discrepancy was detected in his age as recorded in the Company's records and as recorded in Form A and he was asked to appear before the Medical Board to ascertain his age which he refused to do.

19. Question arises whether on the above facts his age as recorded in the company records and accepted by him till before June, 1974, should prevail or the declaration in Form A regarding his age should be preferred and should be accepted and his date of birth should be reckoned as 24th April, 1924, instead of 1st January, 1913. This position is accepted that under Gratuity rules framed by the Company a workman is to superannuate after the age of 60 years.

20. Before I proceed I would like to point out that the workman has not examined himself to explain as to why till before June, 1974, he never raised any objection regarding the date of his birth recorded in the colliery records. This, in my opinion, is a very serious lacunae in his case and although the learned Advocate, Shri D. Narsingh, has strenuously tried to overcome this deficiency he has not been able to retrieve the lost ground. He has referred to a case between India General Navigation and Railway Co. Ltd. and another and the workmen reported in Vol. II S.C.I.J. 1019=1965(10) F.L.R. 250. This Company has the scheme of Provident Fund Institution for its employees and under rule 24 it provides that when the servant of the Company joins the said Institution they have to subscribe to an agreement and inter alia mention the date of birth. According to this rule when the concerned employee joined the Institution on November, 1933 he made the relevant declaration and mentioned 18 Bhadra (Sunday) 1306 B. S. as the date of his birth corresponding to September 3, 1899. It was on the basis of this record that the employee was retired on January 1, 1961.

21. In order to controvert the noted age the concerned employee produced a school certificate and examined a teacher in support of the same but he did not examine himself nor did he file any affidavit to explain the admission made by him in the declaration mentioned above. In this circumstance their Lordships held "It may be that in some cases if the employee is able to satisfy the appellant that the declaration made by him was the result of inadvertence or mistake, the appellant may in a proper case accept the explanation and agree to change the date of birth recorded in the said declaration; that, however, is another matter. In the instant case no such plea was made by the concerned employee and the appellant had no reason to doubt the correctness of the declaration made in regard to the date of his birth". The Company was held to be justified in refusing to accept the age recorded in the school certificate for the purpose of terminating the services of the concerned employee on reaching the age of superannuation.

22. The learned Counsel has referred to this authority in support of his contention that the declaration made in Form A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme will prevail over the age recorded in the records of the Company. To me, however, it appears that the case does not support him, rather, it completely demolishes his case. This is so because the workman has not examined himself, as I have already said earlier to explain as to why till June 1974 he did not raise any objection although several opportunities had

arisen for the same. That being so, a mere declaration in Form A although certified by the Colliery Manager will not have any preference over the undisputed date of birth noted in the Company records.

23. In the Supreme Court case the declaration made in the Provident Fund Institution under rule 24 was accepted by the Company and held to be justified by the Supreme Court on the ground that there was no explanation on behalf of the workman to explain that admission. The school certificate proved by a teacher who was not in existence in the school when the workman's date of birth was noted and which was not accepted by the Company was approved by the Supreme Court on the ground that the teacher was not competent to prove the same. Facts of the present case are very much different. Herein there is no explanation by the workman regarding his tacit acceptance of the date of his birth mentioned in the Company's record and, therefore, I do not see any reason why the declaration in Form A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund should have preference over his recorded age in the Company records. The Supreme Court approved the acceptance of the declaration not because it had been made in the scheme of Provident Fund started for the workman but because there was no better material on record regarding the date of birth of the concerned workman. Herein, as I have already said earlier, on one side there is his unchallenged recorded date of birth since 1948 when he joined his service first and on the other there is a declaration made in Form A which has no particular sanctity as against the age old Company's record. In my opinion, the Supreme Court case is no authority on the point.

24. On behalf of the workmen it has been contended that at the time of his appointment there was no medical examination but when declaration in Form A was made he was medically examined and on this ground also it is said that it should prevail over the former. If we refer to Form A it will appear that it does not provide for any medical examination. MW-2 has stated that before filing this Form employee is not required to be examined by a Doctor for ascertainment of his age. There is nothing on behalf of the workmen to show that he was medically examined when he made declaration in Form A. That being so, I do not think this contention needs any consideration.

25. In this very connection the learned Advocate has referred to Ext. W-6, letter addressed to the Manager, 6 & 7 Pits colliery dated 24/25-6-74 and has submitted that bonus and provident fund section Assistant found the discrepancy in the age of the workman and mentioned it in that letter and requested the Manager to advise him to get a certificate about his age signed by the Colliery Doctor. I have referred to the written statement filed on behalf of the workman where it is said that he refused to appear before the colliery Doctor as he was doubtful if he would get an impartial certificate. It is true that the discrepancy was found by the Assistant and in fact discrepancy was there, but when an opportunity was given to the concerned workman to get his age ascertained he did not avail of it and on imaginary ground refused to appear before a Doctor. This, in my opinion, does not help him in any way rather goes against his case.

26. There is a letter by the Divisional Manager (Collieries) addressed to the concerned workman dated 27/28-6-74 in which all the relevant facts have been explained and there is a particular mention about the declaration made in Form A under the Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme. In my opinion, this letter speaks for itself and the stand taken by the Company, as I have found, seems correct.

27. I have said above that several opportunities arose when the concerned workman could have raised objection regarding his recorded age and Ext. W-1, a letter addressed to him in one on the point. To repeat I may add that identity card as well as bonus card were issued to him where the same date of birth had been recorded. Similarly, in 1953 when he was asked to get any mistake in the date of birth rectified he did not take any step. All these combined together make out a very strong case against him and I do not see any reason to accept the declaration in Form A and to reject the unchallenged date of birth recorded in the Company records which prevailed from the date of his appointment till before June 1974 and the other important circumstances discussed above.

28. A point has been raised on behalf of the management that no industrial dispute could have been raised under Section 2A of the Act as it is not a dispute arising out of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination of his service, rather, it is a case of superannuation and his service automatically came to an end on attaining the age of 60 years. Reference has been made to a case between B. K. Sharma S/o Pandit Srinivas Sharma resident of 103 Palmal Lane, Chopetee Aligarh and State of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Court No. 1, Kanpur and M/s. Glaxo Laboratories (India) Limited Manjoorgarhi Aligarh reported in 1976(32) I.L.R. 280. The employee in this case was employed for a fixed period with condition that the right to continue would automatically come to an end on expiry of the period. It was held that as it was not a dispute arising out of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination of services of the concerned workman Section 2A was not applicable.

29. Shri D. Narsingh in reply has referred to the case of the State Bank of India, vs N. Sundar Mony reported in 1976 Lab. I.C. 769 and has contended that termination of any sort whatsoever would amount to retrenchment and would be covered under Section 25F of the Act.

30. In my opinion, the State Bank of India case has no relevance for our purpose. That was not a case of superannuation and when under the terms of Gratuity scheme framed by the Company the age of superannuation is fixed at 60 years and an employee superannuates completing that age, certainly it will not be retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the Act and provision of Section 25F of the Act will not be attracted.

31. So far as Allahabad case goes it helps to determine the point in issue. It being a case of superannuation and not of dismissal, discharge, retrenchment or termination of service Section 2A of the Act is not applicable and, therefore, no industrial dispute could have been raised and no reference could have been made at the instance of the concerned workman.

32. To conclude I hold that Shri Parmeshwar Mistry, Blacksmith retired from service on completing the age of 60 years and by no stretch of reasoning it can be said to be unjustified. There are overwhelming materials to justify his retirement.

33. Therefore, the management of 6 and 7 Pits, Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron & Steel Co. Limited, P.O. Jamadoba, District Dhanbad, are justified in retiring Shri Parmeshwar Mistry, Blacksmith, with effect from January 1, 1974, when he reached the age of 60 years for which there was sufficient proof. In the circumstances, the concerned workman is entitled to no relief.

This is my award.

S. R. SINHA, Presiding Officer.
[No. I-20012/124/74-LR-II, DIII(A)]

New Delhi, the 29th September, 1977

S.O. 3167.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Industry West Ena Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Dhansar, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 37 of 1977

(Ministry's Order No. I-2012/183/73-LR. II/D. III(A) dated the 30th May, 1975)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Industry West Ena Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Dhansar, Dist. Dhanbad,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 13th September, 1977

AWARD

Five industrial disputes were referred for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 at Dhanbad by Order No. L-2012/183/73-LR, II/D. III(A), dated 30-5-1975 and the same were received by transfer in this Tribunal on March 22, 1975 by Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Order No. S-11025 (I)/77-(i)/D. IV(B), dated 22-2-1977.

2. The first dispute relates to one Baijnath Rajbhar. The case of the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh (hereinafter referred to as the Union) is that Baijnath Rajbhar was a miner in the Industry West Ena Colliery, which is a coking coal mine. He was retrenched along with several other miners, but while the others were taken back and re-employed subsequently, Baijnath Rajbhar was not taken back, and this was so in spite of an Agreement between the Union and the Sub-Area Manager arrived at on October 16, 1973, and the demand of the Union, therefore, is that he should be re-employed in the colliery at least from the date of the Agreement, namely, October 16, 1973.

3. It is not disputed that the Industry West Ena Colliery, a coking coal mine, originally belonged to Kalyanji Mavji & Co. The management of all coking coal mines, including that of Industry West Ena Colliery, was taken over by the Central Government on October 17, 1971 under Section 3 of the Coking Coal Mines (Emergency Provisions) Ordinance, 1971 which was later replaced by the Coking Coal Mines (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1971. Nor is it disputed that all such mines were nationalised and the right, title and interest of the previous owners stood transferred to, and vested absolutely in, the Bharat Coking Coal Limited (hereinafter referred to as the B.C.C.L.), a Government Company, on May 1, 1972 under Section 4 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act.

4. The case of the B.C.C.L. is that Baijnath Rajbhar was in the employment of the previous owner and was not on the establishment rolls of the Colliery either on October 17, 1971 or on May 1, 1972 and there was thus no relationship of employer and employee between them. It has further alleged that the Union has not given any particulars regarding the name of employer, the date of retrenchment, the date on which the workman approached the employer for re-employment and as to who had refused to re-employ him, and hence in the absence of the aforesaid particulars, it would not be possible for the Tribunal to enter upon the adjudication. It has further pleaded that it is the previous owner who had retrenched him and several others before October 17, 1971 and it was again the previous owner who had taken back the others but not Baijnath Rajbhar for the simple reason that he had not presented himself for re-employment. It has denied that there was any Agreement between the Union and the Sub-Area Manager for his re-employment on and from October 16, 1973. Lastly, it has pleaded that under Sec. 9 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, no award can be passed against it for his re-employment.

5. MW-1 Kailash Kumar was the Manager of this colliery from 26-4-73 to 25-4-77. He has denied that Baijnath Rajbhar was ever in the employment of the B.C.C.L. WW-1 Lal B. P. Sinha, the Organising Secretary of the Union, has deposed that Baijnath Rajbhar was retrenched along with about 100 other miners in November 1971, and while the others were re-employed in September or October 1973, no re-employment was given to Baijnath Rajbhar. In cross-examination, he admitted that it is the previous owner who had retrenched the whole lot. That shows that the retrenchment must have taken place before October 17, 1971. He further stated that the previous owner himself had re-employed the others but he at once modified this admission and stated that the others were re-employed by the B.C.C.L. after nationalisation. I am not inclined to place reliance upon

him. There is no documentary evidence to show the date of the dates on which Baijnath Rajbhar and the others were retrenched or the date or dates on which the others were re-employed. The Union took no steps to summon the statutory registers or the Service Records to prove these facts. In the written statement also, the matter was kept shrouded in mystery and all material particulars were withheld. However, he stated that all these particulars were submitted before the A.L.C. during the course of conciliation proceedings but had to admit, when confronted with those proceedings, that the particulars were not submitted even there. I am, therefore, inclined to accept the version of the B.C.C.L. that Baijnath Rajbhar and several others were retrenched by the previous owner and while others were re-employed by him, Baijnath Rajbhar was not re-employed.

6. It appears that there were several issues between the Union and the management, and one of the issues related to the question of re-employment of Baijnath Rajbhar. A discussion took place between MW-1 representing the Union and Sujjan Singh, the Sub-Area Manager on October 11, 1973. The case of Baijnath Rajbhar was also discussed. Ext. W-1 is the Minutes of discussions. Point No. 3 related to him. The Minute says : "He brought the case of Sri Shyam Lal Sharma and of Sri Baijnath Rajwar which is that of pre-take-over. The Org. Secretary was advised to take up the case with the higher authorities. As regards Shri B. Rajwar who is an old miner and as the Union contended that all the other retrenched workers have been taken into employment he should also be taken back and it should be considered favourably." It is apparent from the above that the matter was merely discussed and the Union pleaded for favourable consideration of his case but no decision was taken; and as a matter of fact, the Union was advised to take up his case with higher authorities. It is wrong on the part of the Union, therefore, to allege that there was an Agreement which requires implementation or that Baijnath Rajbhar should be re-employed with effect from October 16, 1973,

7. Section 9, in so far as it is relevant, reads thus : "Sec. 9(1) Every liability of the owner, agent, manager,..... of a coking coal mine..... in relation to any period prior to the appointed day, shall be the liability of such owner, agent, manager,..... as the case may be, and shall be enforceable against him and not against the Central Government or the Government company.

(2) For the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that—

(b) no award..... of any..... Tribunal in relation to any coking coal mine..... passed after the appointed day, but in relation to any matter, claim or dispute which arose before that day, shall be enforceable against the Central Government or the Government company.

8. The retrenchment of Baijnath Rajbhar was made prior to the date of take over. The words "appointed day", as defined by Sec. 3(a) mean the first day of May, 1972. It is obvious that the matter in dispute relates to a period prior to the appointed day, and no award can be passed against the B.C.C.L., a Government company, in respect of that matter. Section 9 came up for interpretation in Bharat Coking Coal Limited vs. Dhanbad Colliery 1976 Lab. I.C. 1513 and the Patna High Court held that no such award can be passed. The result is that this dispute must be decided in favour of the B.C.C.L.

9. The second dispute is whether the management of Industry West Ena Colliery is justified in not departmentalising the four Underground Masons, the two Surface Masons, the eight Underground Mason-Mazdoors and the four Surface Mason-Mazdoors (whose names have been specified in the Schedule to the Reference) on the basis of seniority, even after mutual discussions and Agreement? If not, to what relief are the said Masons and Mason-Mazdoors entitled and from what date?

10. The case of the Union, in its written statement, is that these Masons and Mason-Mazdoors were permanent workmen but were being paid wages by the Colliery contractor. However, an Agreement was reached between the Union and the Management on October 16, 1973 whereunder they were to be departmentalised but the management has failed to implement the Agreement and it should be implemented now under the Award of the Tribunal.

11. The B.C.C.L. has pleaded that these Masons and Mason-Mazdoors were in the employment of contractors and were never on the rolls of the colliery establishment; that there

can be no industrial dispute because there was no relationship of employer and employees between it and them at any material time; that there was no Agreement between it and the Union for their departmentalisation; that no vacancy exists in any post of Mason or Mason-Mazdoor against which they can be departmentalised; that even the services of the departmental Masons and Mason-Mazdoors cannot be fully utilised because of paucity of masonry work; and that it is under no obligation, legal or otherwise, to departmentalise contractor's workmen

12. It is not disputed even by WW1 Lala B. P. Sinha that Masons prepare brick or concrete foundations underground for fixing haulage engines, pumps and stoppings; and on surface; they repair Dhowrahs; and Mason-Mazdoors only help them in their jobs. Such type of work, it can be imagined, will be seasonal in nature or of emergent nature. I have no hesitation in accepting the testimony of MW-1 Kailash Kumar, the Colliery Manager, that even the permanent Masons and Mason-Mazdoors' services can not be fully utilised. WW-1 Lala B. P. Sinha has deposed that all these masons and mason-mazdoors were in the employment of the colliery and not of any contractor. Kailash Kumar has deposed to the category. Even in the written statement, the Union has admitted that these Masons and Mason-Mazdoors were contractor's workmen and were paid by the Contractor and, therefore, Kailash Kumar's testimony must be accepted. It follows that B.C.C.I. is under no legal obligation to departmentalise someone else's workmen as its own.

13. With regard to the Agreement, Point No. 5 relates to this controversy. Ext. W-1 mentions: "The Union..... has demanded that the case of Mason-Mazdoors numbering about 59 which includes Masons, Mason Kamins and Mason-Mazdoors working under different contractors should be made departmental. The union has demanded that their Category and pay should be fixed accordingly. Out of these 59 persons, ten are Masons, 35 are Mason-Mazdoors and rest are Mason Kamins. In view of the fact that due to this dispute all masonry work is at present stopped for the last one month it is, therefore, suggested that 4 Masons with 8 Mazdoors for underground work and 2 Masons with 4 Mazdoors for surface work may be approved to make them departmental. They will be utilised anywhere in Industry Colliery." Even the discussions show that Lala B. P. Sinha has perhaps not told the truth that the Masons and Mason-Mazdoors were not contractor's men or were not paid by them when he himself had told the Sub-Area Manager that they were contractor's men and they should be departmentalised and their category and pay should be fixed. It appears that masonry work had come to a halt for about a month on account of this dispute. The Sub-Area Manager did not enter into any Agreement with the Union. He only noted down the gist of the discussions. He took the view that on account of the dispute some Masons and Mason Mazdoors should be departmentalised and he submitted his views to his next higher authority, namely, the General Manager. Ext. W-1 itself mentions these facts that he forwarded the Minutes to the General Manager for his "information and kind consideration". The recommendation, however, remained a recommendation and did not ripen into an Agreement. The Sub-Area Manager could not have appointed a new hand himself as the power to appoint a new hand vested not in him but in the General Manager. This is the version given by MW-1 Kailash Kumar and he finds corroboration from the circumstance that the Sub-Area Manager had to seek the orders of the General Manager. Kailash Kumar has further deposed that the General Manager turned down the recommendation. An argument was raised that the General Manager's written orders have not been produced and, therefore, Kailash Kumar's testimony should not be accepted. I do not see why he should be dis-believed. He is a responsible officer. Indeed, had the General Manager accepted the recommendation, the Sub-Area Manager would have implemented it at once as he was the recommending authority. The Union would also have called for the document, but this was not done. This dispute must also, therefore, be decided against the Union.

14. The third dispute is whether the management of Industry West Ena Colliery are justified in not departmentalising the work and paying Category IV wages of Rs. 5.90 basic to the 12 Screening Mazdoors (whose names are specified in the Schedule) even after mutual discussions and Agreement? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date?

15. In its written statement, the Union has pleaded that Screening job is of a permanent nature but the 12 Screening Mazdoors were in the employment of a contractor. However, an agreement was reached between the Union and the management on October 16, 1973 for their departmentalisation and they should, therefore, be departmentalised on the basis of the Agreement.

16. The case of the B.C.C.I. is that these 12 Screening Mazdoors were contractor's workmen and not of the Industry West Ena Colliery; and there was no relationship of employer and employees between it and them and consequently there could be no industrial dispute. It has further pleaded that Screening job is of a temporary character because screening is required only for supply of coal of proper sizes to the Railway administration. It has averred that demand for loco coal is of an intermittent nature and subject to wide variations and it is not possible on that account to have any permanent strength of such Mazdoors. It has denied that there was an Agreement for their departmentalisation and it has also pleaded that there is no legal obligation on its part to departmentalise contractor's workmen.

17. The Screening job consists of selecting coal pieces of proper size/sizes. The process of screening consists of putting coal pieces into a sieve. Such sieves have two inches holes in them. Coal pieces of smaller sizes fall on the ground through the holes, while coal pieces of proper sizes remain in the sieve. There is no dispute about the process between Kailash Kumar and Lala B. P. Singh. They are, however, not in agreement as to why this screening is done. Kailash Kumar has deposed that this is done for two reasons, namely, for the supply of proper size coal pieces to the Railway administration for loco use and for manufacture of soft coke. He has deposed that the demand of loco coal dwindled and came to a complete stop in April 1974 and no soft coke is manufactured because the colliery is a coking coal mine. Thus, according to him, there is no job left for these Mazdoors. Lala B. P. Sinha has deposed that Screening is not done for railway supply at all and that it is done only for manufacture of soft coke. He has further stated that it is true that Industry West Ena Colliery is a coking coal mine but the Bhagatdih Rise Section, which is a constituent part of Industry West Ena Colliery, is a non-coking coal mine and, therefore, the necessity for screening mazdoors is there for screening proper size coal pieces for the manufacture of soft coke. Let me assume that some screening mazdoors are still required for soft coke manufacture business. The question, however, is as to how many are required. Lala B. P. Sinha has deposed that the past strength was of 20 to 25 such Mazdoors but 12 were stopped from working, while the remaining were deployed as Wagon Loaders. This fact shows that no necessity was felt to keep the past strength of such Mazdoors in tact. Lala B. P. Sinha has denied that these mazdoors were contractor's men but that fact is admitted in the written statement itself. Kailash Kumar has deposed that all the Screening Mazdoors were contractor's workmen. That being so, the B.C.C.I. is not bound to employ them departmentally.

18. Ext. W-1 refers to this dispute in point No. 6. It says "Case of 12 Screening Mazdoors and about their payment, the Union contended that as they are coming under Cat. IV, they should be paid minimum wages i.e. Rs. 5.90 per day on the basis of 4.5 work load per head per day and also a V.D.A. of Rs. 3.06 per day per head. 11 workers are involved in this. The demand appears to be reasonable." It is wrong, therefore, to say that the parties had arrived at an Agreement. The Sub-Area Manager had only expressed his view that the demand was reasonable but had not made any commitment. His views were not accepted to the General Manager and that was the final word. The Tribunal will not compel the B.C.C.I. to employ these Screening Mazdoors departmentally when they have no legal claim for it.

19. The fourth dispute is whether the management of Industry West Ena Colliery are justified in not making a nucleus strength of wagon loaders for Bhagatdih Rise Section from the casual pool of wagon loaders as agreed upon by the Sub-Area Manager after mutual discussions on 11-10-78? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date.

20. The Union has alleged that the common practice is that there should be a nucleus of permanent wagon loaders, and the recruitment should be from the pool of casual wagon loaders. It was also pleaded that Bhagatdih Rise Section was an independent colliery but was merged in the Industry West Ena Colliery after nationalisation. Before merger, the

Bhuggatdi Rise Section had a pool of casual workman. It has further pleaded that the Sub-Area Manager and the Union reached an Agreement that the casual wagon loaders of the Bhuggatdi Rise Section pool should be made permanent on the basis of their seniority.

21. The B.C.C.L. has alleged that there is a nucleus of permanent wagon loaders for the entire colliery and it is not desirable to have a separate nucleus for the Bhuggatdi Rise Section. It has also pleaded that originally there were 185 permanent wagon loaders and this nucleus was sufficient for wagon loading job for the entire colliery, including the Bhuggatdi Rise Section. Indeed, according to the pleadings, even the services of these 185 cannot be utilised daily for the reason that there is no regularity in the placement of wagons by the Railway at the Railway sidings. It has denied the agreement also.

22. Admittedly, Industry West Ena and Bhuggatdi Rise Section were two independent collieries. Bhuggatdi Rise Section colliery was merged in the Industry West Ena Colliery on August 1, 1972, according to Kailash Kumar MW-1, and in 1974, according to Lala B. P. Sinha. Be that as it may there is no denial that before merger each of the two collieries had separate strengths of wagon loaders. Lala B. P. Sinha has admitted that there were no permanent wagon loaders in the Bhuggatdi Rise Section colliery before merger and there was only a casual pool of 36 wagon loaders. The Union's demand is that 15 out of these 36 should be made permanent on the basis of their seniority. He has denied that the placement of wagons has considerably decreased at the railway sidings. The average number of wagons placed daily in 1976 was 35 but it has come down to 15—20 since then. Only 4 or 5 wagons used to be placed at the Bhuggatdi Railway Siding. It is not disputed that 5 wagon loaders are needed to load a wagon. The present need, therefore, is for 125. The strength, according to Kailash Kumar, is 185, and according to Lala B. P. Sinha, is 165. In either case, there are more permanent wagon loaders than are needed for the job. It is obvious that no industry can afford to employ unproductive labour because that will involve wasteful expenditure and erode the margin of its profits. No one can be paid for sitting idle. The maxim "no work, no pay" is a well-known maxim. It is a matter of common experience that the placement of wagons by the Railway at colliery railway siding is erratic and unpredictable. The fate of a wagon loader is really hard because he may go to the mine and sit idle, and then return home, without work and without pay. The Industry is also in a predicament. It cannot be expected to pay when a wagon loader does no work. That is the reason why a nucleus of permanent wagon loaders is maintained and the rest are kept in a casual pool. They can go into the permanent nucleus if there is a vacancy. The Union has not shown that the Bhuggatdi Rise Section's casual wagon loaders were senior to their counterparts in the Industry West Ena Colliery before merger. Had the Union led evidence to show that some of the old casual wagon loaders of Bhuggatdi Rise Section are senior to the old wagon loaders of Industry West Ena Colliery, I would have had something before me on the basis of which I could give an award, but that basis is not before me.

23. As regards the agreement, point No. 7 of Ext. W-1 relates to this controversy. It reads: "Union wanted that there should be a permanent pool of wagon loaders of Bhuggatdi Rise Area also since the truck loading has been made departmental. This pool should be made from amongst the workers (casual Wagon Loaders) existing there at present. Now we want to suggest that 15 senior most Wagon Loaders may be made permanent." This does not mean that the Sub-Area Manager had agreed to it. Even if I proceed on the assumption that the word "we" refers to the Union and the Sub-Area Manager, they only made a suggestion which was not accepted by the General Manager. This dispute must also, therefore, be decided against the Union.

24. The fifth dispute is whether the management of West Ena Colliery are justified in not giving a job to Sagir Mia, a Winding Engine Khalasi, who has been working as such since long? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

25. The case of the Union is that Sagir Mia worked as Winding Engine Khalasi for a long time with full satisfaction but the management stopped him from work without any justifiable cause. The Union has also pleaded that an agreement was also arrived at between it and the B.C.C.L. on October 16, 1973 for his re-employment but that agreement

has not been implemented so far and its implementation may be directed to be made now.

26. The case of the B.C.C.L. is that Gafoor Mia, father of Sagir Mia, was actually the Winding Engine Khalasi but he fell ill and proceeded on long leave; and it was in these circumstances, that the colliery manager permitted Sagir Mia to work temporarily in place of his father. No formal appointment was given to him and his name was also not entered on the rolls to the colliery establishment, and he drew wages not in his own name but in the name of his father. However, when his irregular working was detected, he was stopped from work and he cannot be appointed as he has no legal right to claim an appointment.

27. MW-1 Kailash Kumar has deposed that Gafoor Mia was a Winding Engine Khalasi. He pretends not even to know Sagir Mia and says that he was never in the employment of the colliery. He has then deposed that he merely used to draw his wages in the name of his father; and as soon as he discovered this irregularity, he stopped him from work. WW-1 Lala B. P. Sinha has stated that Gafoor Mia was the Winding Engine Khalasi but he left his job and thereafter the management appointed Sagir Mia as permanent Winding Engine Khalasi in place of his father and he continued to work for about a year, when he was stopped from working. His cross-examination shows that Gafoor Mia developed cancer sometime in 1973 and was admitted as an in-door patient in the Cancer Section of TISCO's Hospital at Jamshedpur and because of his illness he did not work and did not draw his wages. Sagir was appointed as a Relieving Winding Engine Khalasi on a temporary basis but was subsequently made permanent. The management, however, adopted the device of drawing bills in the name of Gafoor Mia and paying the wages to Sagir Mia, even though Gafoor Mia was not working and Sagir Mia was actually working. This practice continued for about a year when a new cashier was appointed and he questioned Sagir as to why he had appeared to draw wages meant for Gafoor and thereupon Sagir told the Cashier that he was actually working and bills should be drawn in his name and payment should also be made in his own name. But the cashier was unwilling to do so, and Sagir made a representation to the colliery Superintendent who instead of accepting his request, stopped him from work. It was suggested to him that Sagir, as a matter of fact, never worked in the colliery and merely used to present himself periodically on the pay day to receive payment in the name of his father, but the witness denied the truth of the suggestion. It was further suggested to him that a Winding Engine Khalasi is a competent person who cannot work in a colliery unless he obtains a certificate of being a competent person under the Mines Act and Regulations, and to this the witness replied that Sagir had such a certificate. The witness produced Ext. W-3 and W-4 as two such certificates. Ext. W-3 is dated April 15, 1968 and Ext. W-4 is dated August 28, 1971 and both authorise him to work as a Winding Engine Khalasi as and when required, strictly on temporary basis. Ext. W-3 was issued by the Mining Engineer and Ext. W-4 by the Colliery Manager.

28. A "competent person" in relation to any work or any machinery, plant or equipment means a person who has attained the age of 21 years and who has been duly appointed in writing by the manager as a person competent to supervise or perform that work, or to supervise the operation of that machinery, plant or equipment and who is responsible for the duties assigned to him. See Regulation 2(7). The job of a Winding Engine Khalasi is to operate the steam or electric driven engine which raises or lowers cages in which men or material may be raised or lowered in the mine shaft. The job of a Winding Engine Khalasi is such that unless there is a man to work the steam or electric Winding Engine, not only mining operations will come to a grinding halt but the safety of men and materials present underground would be seriously endangered if there is caving or inundation or presence of gas. There is a "Banksman", present on the top of the mine and an "Onsetter" present at the pit bottom for giving signals for raising or lowering. The Banksman is in control of the Shaft top and gives the signals to the Onsetter and the Winding Engine Man when the cages are to be wound in the shaft with coal or men or materials. The Onsetter works underground and performs similar duties to those of the Banksman. It is obvious, therefore, that there would be chaos if no Winding Engine Khalasi is present. There might be inundation, there might be caveings, there might be lethal gas present in the mine. In such emergent cases, at least men have to be sent from underground to the top through the cages. The absence

of a Winding Engine Khalasi will be fatal in such circumstances. Even ordinarily, without any emergency, the Engine has to be run to lower men or materials or to raise coal, men and materials. Lala B. P. Sinha has deposed that in the absence of Gafoor Mia, his son was actually working. Kailash Kumar would like me to believe that Gafoor Mia was not replaced by his son. But he does not say as to who then worked in place of the ailing Gafoor Mia. The statutory register could have been produced to falsify Lala B. P. Sinha's story. Indeed, Ext. W-1 completely supports Lala B. P. Sinha and completely demolishes the version of Kailash Kumar. The controversy regarding Sagir Mia was discussed at Point No. 8 in Ext. W-1. It reads: "Union also brought the case of Sri Sagir Mia, who worked as Winding Engine Khalasi in place of his father who was long sick under treatment at Tata, whose name is Gafoor Mia, for a period of about one year. For working so he had authority from the colliery manager and Engineer. The Secretary produced the authorisation letter. In the colliery records such as attendance register his attendance had not been marked but the same has been marked for Gafoor Mia, his father who was under treatment at Jamshedpur during that period. Our enquiry reveals that Sagir Mia has actually worked as Winding Engine Khalasi during that period but attendance was shown and bills were made in the name of his father. Sri Sagir Mia has been stopped from work with effect from 4-7-73. In our view, as Sri Sagir Mia worked for a considerable period of time and there is no complaint about his work and there is shortage of Winding Engine Khalasis, it is recommended that Sri Sagir Mia's case may be considered favourably."

29. It is futile, therefore, on the part of the B.C.C.I. to contend that Sagir Mia never worked or he was not appointed by the management. Authorisation letters were produced before the Sub-Area Manager. Indeed, the Sub-Area Manager made enquiries and found that it is Sagir Mia who had actually worked for a long time, though his name was not entered in the rolls and though bills were drawn in the name of his father and payments were made to Sagir Mia. There was no complaint against his work. There was real shortage also of Winding Engine Khalasis. I am surprised, therefore, that the General Manager did not accept the recommendation of the Sub-Area Manager. I find that Sagir Mia had actually worked. His father was long ill and evidence shows that he actually died of his cancer ailment. Sagir Mia was working against a vacancy in a permanent post. He worked for about one year. He must, therefore, be re-employed.

30. My award is that Baijnath Rajbhar is not entitled to any relief; that the 12 workmen whose names are specified in Part (2) of the Schedule are also not entitled to any relief; that the Screening Mazdoors whose names are specified in Part (3) of the Schedule are also not entitled to any relief; that casual wagon loaders referred to in Part (4) of the Schedule are also not entitled to any relief; but Sagir Mia should be re-instated with effect from July 4, 1973 as Winding Engine Khalasi. No back wages, however, will be paid to him.

K. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer.
[No. 1-20012/183/73-I. II/D. III A]
S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 28th September, 1977

S.O. 3168.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Korea Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Korea, District Surguja and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd September, 1977.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)**

Case Ref. No. CGIT/LC(R)(12)/1977

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Korea Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Korea and their workmen represented through Shri P. K. Thakur, Surguja Coal Workers Union (AITUC) P.O. Korea, District Surguja (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Workman—Shri P. K. Thakur, Advocate
For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mines DISTRICT : Surguja (M.P.)

Dated, September 19, 1977

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, vide its Order No. L-22012(34)/76-DIII(B)/IV(B) dated 14-4-1977, to this Tribunal for adjudicating the following industrial dispute :—

"Whether the action of the management of Korea Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Korea, District Surguja in demoting Shri Amol Mukherjee from Category V Electrical Fitter to Category II Fitter Helper vide their letter No. KR/CMA/Disc./6820-24, dated 8-10-1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Short undisputed facts of the case are that Shri Amol Mukherjee was charge-sheeted by the management for the following misconducts :

- (i) He led the mob of about 100 persons along with Shri Kamla Pandey;
- (ii) Gheraoed Shri A. S. Desai, Asstt. Labour Welfare Officer from 8.30 a.m. to 3 p.m.
- (iii) Thumped on his table;
- (iv) Incited others to violence; and
- (v) Threatened him of dire consequences by raising slogans that

ALWO KO MARO

ALWO SALA CHOR ILAI

ALWO KA KHON PELO

Senior Personnel Officer, Shri B. K. Sinha was appointed as Enquiry Officer. He held most of the charges proved against Amol Mukherjee. Two of the counts were held to be not proved against him. The enquiry was held jointly against Amol Mukherjee and Kedar Pandey. On receiving the report disciplinary authority accepted it and after giving second show cause notice for punishment, demoted Shri Amol Mukherjee from Category V Workman (Fitter) to Category II (Electrical Helper).

3. The charges related to an incident where the workmen Gheraoed the A.L.W.O. insisting upon him to make immediate arrangement of drinking water for the workers and their families.

4. The case of the management is that major misconducts were proved before the Enquiry Officer which enquiry was conducted fairly giving adequate opportunity of defence. A lenient view was taken in the matter of punishment and the findings based on reliable evidence.

5. The case of the Union is that the charges were not established. Shri Desai's uncorroborated statement could not be believed. The other witnesses contradicted him. Thus the findings were perverse. Principles of Natural Justice were not followed. Enquiry Officer was biased. Punishment was too harsh inasmuch as the demotion was by three categories. In fact at the time of argument, Shri Thakur appearing for the Union pressed only two points namely that the findings of the Enquiry Officer were perverse and the punishment was too harsh hence required soft considerations under Sec. 11A of Industrial Disputes Act.

6. Though of course the point of bias was not pressed in arguments I may briefly deal with it because that point was raised in the pleadings by saying that Enquiry Officer was the Officer of the very Personnel Department to which Shri Desai, Asstt. Labour Welfare Officer belonged. He had come to know the facts from before and had a prejudiced mind. It is not alleged in the pleadings nor there is any evidence that the Enquiry Officer was present at the time of incident. He had an open mind. He discharged the delinquent on two counts. Simply because the incident took place against his subordinate, it cannot be argued that he was biased. In fact he conducted the enquiry in a just and fair manner.

7. Tribunal while dealing with such a case does not sit as an appellate authority and has no jurisdiction to reappraise the evidence. The Enquiry Officer can believe a single witness—an uncorroborated testimony, can discard minor contradictions as unimportant, can draw inferences from circumstances and the latest view is that there is no allergy for him to rely even upon hearsay evidence if it has some reliable source and foundation.

8. Perversity in the findings can be either because it is based on no evidence, or because no reasonable man could have reached that conclusion on the basis of the evidence on record. It was so held in *Central Bank of India Ltd. Vs. Prakash Chand Jain* [(1969-II-ILJ 377 (380)]. It cannot be termed as perverse simply because a different view could be possible. It is argued that in this respect there was no evidence that this delinquent thumped the table. On page 9 of the report there is a clear finding that 'prosecution failed to prove that Amol Mukherjee had thumped the table of ALWO'. It is thus clear that there was no finding of guilty on this count because there was no evidence. The Enquiry Officer did give a finding that 'though there was no direct evidence that Amol Mukherjee incited the mob yet there is strong circumstantial evidence which can lead to that conclusion', and I have no reason to differ from him in this respect. In short learned Counsel for the delinquent has not been able to show that any finding was based on no evidence.

9. As regards the other aspect I am of the view after close scrutiny of the evidence recorded by the Enquiry Officer that his appraisal of the evidence was not such as can be said to be perverse in the sense that no reasonable man could have come to that finding. No where the evidence against Kamla Pandey was read against Amol Mukherjee and no prejudice appears to have been caused because of the joint enquiry when both the delinquents were charged with respect to the same incident and identical question of law and fact were involved. I am, therefore, of the view that the findings were not perverse.

10. This brings us to the question of punishment. No punishment of demotion is provided in Standing Orders. Demoting by three stages is too harsh a punishment specially when the demonstration was for arranging drinking water which is the basic necessity of a worker as of any other man. Tempers are likely to be raised on such a basic issue. I think the initial fault lay with the management which could not even make this basic arrangement for a workman. The person leading a demonstration on such a demand has to be emphatic and angry. In my opinion a lenient punishment of stoppage of two annual increments and censure would meet the ends of justice in such a case.

11. The punishment awarded by the management is therefore set aside, though the findings of guilt are maintained. The management do restore the workman back to his position as a category V Fitter, restore his seniority and pay as if no order of punishment was passed and grant him all arrears of pay on that account within two months of the publication of this award, and the disciplinary authority shall be deemed to have passed the punishment of stoppage of two increments and censure on the date on which this award is published in the Gazette of India. Award is given accordingly.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer,

[No. L-22012(34)/76-D-III(B)/D-IV(B)]

BHUPENDRA NATH, Desk Officer,

New Delhi, the 29th September, 1977

S.O. 3169.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Mysore and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th September, 1977.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL IN KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

Dated 20th September, 1977

Reference No. 11 of 1975 (Central)

I PARTY.

Workman Sri Syed Rasool, (Ex-Serviceman), Jumma Masjid Road, Chamurajnagar, Mysore.

Vs.

II PARTY.

The Managing Director, State Bank of Mysore (Head Office), Bangalore-9.

APPEARANCES :

For the I Party—Sri R. Gurnurajan, Advocate, Bangalore.

For the II Party—Sri G. P. Shivaprakash, Advocate, Bangalore.

REFERENCE

(1) Government Order No. L. 12012/129/75/DII/A dated 25-10-1975)

(2) Government Order No. S-11025(4)/77-D-IV(B) Dated 11-8-77

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

"Is the management of the State Bank of Mysore, Bangalore justified in terminating Shri Syed Rasool from service with effect from the 27th November, 1974? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. On receipt of the Reference, notices were taken out on both the parties.

3. The I Party filed the Statement contending that as an Ex-serviceman, who had served in two Wars viz., 1939 to 1945 (Burma War), his retirement age may be relaxed and that he may be offered appointment as Night Watchman once again on regular basis, or he may be sanctioned with full salary and allowances as from the date of termination of his service or that he may be provided with the benefits of section 25(f) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. The II Party filed the statement contending that on the basis of the documents made available and enquiries made in that connection, it was found that Syed Rasool was 41 years old in February 1968 itself when he was appointed as a casual employee to start with and was over aged, since the Service Rules provide that for appointment as Peon/Watchman, the candidate should be between 18 and 25 years of age. The termination of services of Syed Rasool was not by way of retrenchment.

5. However, both the parties took some time to report settlement and on 15-3-1977, both the parties filed a Joint Memo.

6. I have gone through the Joint Memo filed by the parties. It is seen that in the Joint Memo, the just decision that would be arrived at regarding Syed Rasool's date of birth has been made by taking into consideration, Syed Rasool's date of discharge from the Military service and that some relaxation in the maximum age limit for appointment as Watchman has been made thereby providing for Syed Rasool's fresh appointment as a watchman. The terms of settlement are therefore quite fair and reasonable. The Joint Memo is accordingly accepted.

7. In the result, an Award is passed in terms of the Joint Memo filed by the parties, a copy of which shall be annexed to this award. No order as to costs.

F. F. ALVARES, Presiding Officer,

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE

Reference No. 11 of 1975 (Central)

Syed RasoolFirst Party.

Vs.

The Managing Director,
State Bank of Mysore,

Head Office, Bangalore-9.Second Party.

JOINT MEMO

The parties in the above matter report compromise of the dispute as follows :—

1. The second party agrees to appoint the first party as a watchman in any of the existing vacancies in the post of watchman. His date of birth shall be 28-12-1927, as disclosed by his Military discharge certificate and the said date be the basis for his tenure of service in the Bank.

2. In view of the above, the first party agree to give up his demands/claims against the second party for arrears of salary/back wages, if any, for the period between the date of termination of service (i.e., 26-11-1974) and the date of appointment in terms of para 1 above or for any other antecedent period.

3. The first party hereby places on record that he has no other pending dispute/claims of whatever kind against the second party.

Wherefore, the parties pray for an award in terms of the above.

Sd/-

Advocate for first party

Sd/-

FIRST PARTY.

Sd/-

Advocate for second party.

Sd/-

SECOND PARTY.

Bangalore,

Dated : 15-3-1977.

F. L. F. ALVARES, Presiding Officer.

[F. No. I-12012/129/75-D.II.A]

S.O. 3170.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India, Bombay and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TRIBUNAL
AT BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT 45 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Reserve Bank of India, Bombay,
AND
Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri Mayura Padmanabhan, Deputy
Legal Advisor.

For the Workman—Shri L. K. Pande, Vice President,
Reserve Bank Workers' Organization, Bombay.

STATE : Maharashtra

INDUSTRY : Banking

Bombay, the 3rd August, 1977

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the Reserve Bank of India, Bombay in not treating Shrimati A. A. Manjrekar as Senior to Shrimati S. Y. Kamat in the post of Punch Operator is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The authorised representative of the Reserve Bank of India Workers' Organization, which has sponsored the case

of the workman, Smt. A. A. Manjrekar, has filed a written statement setting out the following facts. Smt. A. A. Manjrekar (Kum. Haldankar) was appointed in the Bank's service as Punch Operator on the 27th July, 1961 whereas Smt. Kamat (Kum. Shambhag) was appointed in the same grade on the 25th January, 1962. Smt. Kamat was appointed later than Smt. Manjrekar but was confirmed earlier than is, from the 10th February, 1963. A representation for correcting the wrong done to her was filed by Smt. Manjrekar by means of an application dated the 25th February, 1972 (Exhibit W-3). It was stated there that recently she happened to see the seniority list of the Punch Operators in which she had been wrongly shown as junior. She made enquiries and represented that since all along her service record was clean there appeared to occur some administrative mistake at the time of confirmation. By their letter dated the 8th June, 1972 (Exhibit W-4) the Bank did not accede to the request. The matter was taken to the Assistant Labour Commissioner and on submission of failure report the present reference has been made.

3. Contentions of the Organization is that the action of the management in not treating Smt. Manjrekar senior to Smt. Kamat is mala fide in character and not in accordance with the norms and procedures followed by the Bank. The Rule that prevails in the Bank is that the persons recruited first in the Bank's service get the priority in seniority and that Smt. Manjrekar was never served with any memo or any charge sheet listing out the deficiencies. It is stated that the procedure adopted by the Bank was contrary to the Award of the National Tribunal decision. Para 17.8 of the Award has been appended to the written statement. It runs as follows :

"17.8 Having carefully considered all aspects of the matter and all the evidence placed before me, in view of the limited scope of the item under reference, I am unable to give any specific directions to the Bank in connection therewith. I can only generally observe that it is desirable that it is possible, without detriment to the interests of the Bank and without affecting efficiency, to group employees in a particular category serving in different departments at one centre together for the purpose of being considered for promotion, a common seniority list of such employees should be maintained. The same would result in opening up equal avenues of promotion for a large number of employees and there would be lesser sense of frustration and greater peace of mind among the employees."

4. The Reserve Bank of India has filed its written statement of claim saying that the services of both these two workers are governed by the Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Staff Regulations') which lay down the terms and conditions of the services of the employees of the Bank. Regulations 28 and 29 of the same read as follows :

"28. An employee confirmed in the Bank's service shall ordinarily rank for seniority in his grade according to his date of confirmation in the grade and an employee on probation according to the length of his probationary service.

29. All appointments and promotions shall be made at the discretion of the Bank and notwithstanding his seniority in a grade no employee shall have a right to be appointed or promoted to any particular post or grade."

It will be noticed that under Regulation 28 employees of the Bank rank for seniority according to the dates of confirmation. The Bank's case is that since Smt. Manjrekar was confirmed after Smt. Kamat, she ranks junior and that in terms of Regulation 29, notwithstanding the seniority in a grade no employee has a right to be appointed or promoted to any particular post or grade. Hence in view of these two provisions Smt. Manjrekar cannot claim seniority nor can she claim to be appointed or promoted to any post or grade in preference to Smt. Kamat. Smt. Manjrekar was confirmed on the 30th June, 1963 and Smt. Kamat on the 12th February, 1963 and a common office order dated the 3rd July, 1963 was issued regarding confirmation of both the employees and copies of the said order were endorsed to both of them. Despite the receipt of the office order Smt. Manjrekar did not represent or file any appeal against the confirmation, even though under Regulation 48 of the Staff Regulations she had a right of appeal. Curiously enough after 9 years Smt. Manjrekar made a representation for the first time in 1972.

On facts the Bank's case is that four posts of Punch Operators (Class III Cadre) were sanctioned in June, 1961. As there was no certainty then whether or not these posts will be continued beyond 6 months, appointment to them was required to be made purely on temporary basis for the specific period of 6 months. At that time the following 4 candidates were placed at the top in the waiting list of Punch Operators on the basis of their performance in the punching test and interview :—

1. Shri N. K. Trivedi.
2. Smt. S. Y. Kamat.
3. Smt. A. A. Manjrekar.
4. Smt. M. R. Shringarpure.

They were required to undergo general check-up of their health. The first candidate namely Shri Trivedi declined the offer. The second candidate Smt. S. Y. Kamat, who was ranked above Smt. Manjrekar in such waiting list on the basis of the performance in the test and interview, informed the Bank that she was already holding a permanent appointment in the office of the Housing Commissioner, Bombay and as such her case may be considered when a long term/permanent vacancy arose and in the meantime she may be permitted to retain her lien in the waiting list. In view of the circumstances mentioned by her the Bank acceded to her request. The third candidate Smt. A. A. Manjrekar accepted the temporary post and after a general medical check-up was appointed purely on temporary basis for the period of six months with effect from 27th July, 1961. In January, 1962 it was found necessary to continue the temporary post for a further period of 6 months and there was prospect of the posts being made permanent. It was, therefore, decided to appoint Smt. Kamat against one of the posts. She was offered the post and was subjected to a detailed medical examination by the Bank's medical officer. After she was declared medically fit, she was appointed with effect from 25th January, 1962 on a temporary basis for a period upto 30th June, 1962. Similar offer was also made to Smt. Manjrekar whose tenure of a purely temporary appointment was due to expire on 26th January, 1962. She was also subjected to a detailed medical examination and on her being found medically fit she was appointed with effect from 27th January, 1962. The contention of the Bank is that since the Bank had agreed to retain Smt. Kamat in the waiting list and also since appointment was made in January, 1962 after the subjecting the candidates to detailed medical examination, Smt. Kamat ranked senior to Smt. Manjrekar. After 30th June, 1962 the period was extended upto December, 1962 and again upto June, 1963. In the meantime in February, 1963 and June, 1963 two permanent vacancies occurred Smt. Kamat, who was senior, was confirmed in the Bank's service with effect from 12th February, 1963 and Smt. Manjrekar with effect from 30th June, 1963. The office order issued contained details of confirmation of both these employees and a copy each of the order was given to both of them. The Bank, on the facts set out about, contends that the seniority of Smt. Manjrekar has been properly fixed and there is no ground for interference.

4-A. The Organization has fixed a rejoinder to the statement of claim filed by the Bank. It is contended therein that action of the management in treating Smt. Kamat senior to Smt. Manjrekar came to light when the chance to officiate as a Sorter Operator was denied to Smt. Manjrekar in 1972. Thereafter the matter was immediately taken up on 25th February, 1972. She had protested earlier in 1963 and thereafter orally to immediate officers and she was assured that her claim of seniority will be protected. The manner in which Smt. Kamat has been ranked senior to Smt. Manjrekar discriminatory in character and bad in law. It is also their contention that theory of appointment without a thorough medical examination is not a factual reality but an imaginary state.

5. The Bank has also filed a rejoinder controverting allegations made in the rejoinder filed by the Organization.

6. The office order confirming Smt. Kamat (Kum. R. S. Shanbhag) w.e.f. 12-2-1963 and that of Smt. Manjrekar (Kum. P. L. Haldankar) w.e.f. 30-6-1963 was issued on 3-7-1963 (vide Ex. W-2) and its copy was sent to each of these two employees. The first time when Smt. Manjrekar represented against the seniority list and the date of her confirmation vis-a-vis Smt. Kamath, was by means of a representation dated 25-2-1972 (vide Ex. W-3) wherein she stated that recently she happened to see the seniority list of Punch Operators in which she has been ranked below her junior which she says is for no fault of her and there seemed to be some adminis-

trative mistake and she requested the Manager, Reserve Bank of India to look into the matter and set right the record. By letter dated 8-6-1972 (Ex. W-4) her request was turned down and then as has been stated earlier the matter was taken to the conciliation proceeding and on its failure the present reference has been made. In her evidence Smt. Manjrekar has deposed that when she received the office order Ex. W-2, she represented the matter to her immediate officer orally and that he promised orally that he will look into the matter at the time of promotion. This is how an attempt has been made to explain the long delay in agitating the matter. There are several reasons, why it is difficult to place reliance on her statements. Had she made an oral representation immediately on receipt of Ex. W-2, she must have mentioned this fact in her representation (Ex. W-3) to the Manager. Secondly, she must have incorporated in her representation Ex. W-3 the fact that on her oral representation to her immediate officer she had been given an assurance. Thirdly, no name has been disclosed as to whom she had made the oral representation and who had held out hopes to her. In the circumstances it must be said that it was only after nine years that Smt. Manjrekar has agitated the matter. That applications after a lapse of so many years should not be countenanced has been laid down by their Lordship of the Supreme Court in *Lawrence Sicil D'Silva V/s. Union of India and others* (1975, II, LLJ 98). In that case the seniority of the petitioner was determined as long ago as 1956 and the writ was filed in 1971. It was held that the petitioner cannot be allowed to challenge the list after so many years. It was observed that "raising up old matter like seniority after long time is likely to result in administrative complications and difficulties. It would, therefore, appear to be in the interest of the smoothness and efficiency of service that such matters should be given a quietus after lapse of some time." It seems to me that a period of nine years is sufficiently long and that being so on the reasoning assigned by their Lordships of the Supreme Court, it must be held that the present matter should be now given a quietus.

7. Apart from the above position in law, on facts and regulations also Smt. Manjrekar has no case.

8. It has already been stated above that Smt. Manjrekar was appointed on a temporary basis for a period of six months only and that period continued to be extended from time to time. (Vide Exhibits E-1, E-2, E-4 and E-5) They extended the period from 20-7-1961 upto the end of June, 1963. In the very first letter (Ex. E-1) the terms and conditions of her appointment have been out and it has been stated therein that Chapter IV of the Bank's Staff Regulations regarding conduct, discipline and appeals except Regulations 46 and 47 will be applicable to her. It will be noticed that under Regulation 48 of the Staff Regulations an employee has a right of appeal against any order passed by the Superior Authority which injuriously affects his interest. According to Smt. Manjrekar ranking her junior to Smt. Kamath injuriously affected her and, therefore, under Regulation 48 she had a right to appeal. No reason has been assigned why such a right was not availed of by her at the appropriate time.

9. The kind of medical certificate that Smt. Manjrekar had been producing when her temporary appointments were extended from time to time will appear from Ex. W-5 dated 18-7-1961, Ex. W-6 dated 19-1-1962. The first one says she is clinically fit for appointment on temporary basis only. The second one says that she is fit.

10. When Smt. Kamath was also appointed on temporary basis she produced a medical certificate (Enclosure to Ex. W-7) and there also what was stated was that she was fit. But when they were to be appointed on a permanent basis, they were thoroughly examined and this will appear from Ex. W-8 and Ex. W-9. Ex. W-8 dated 23-1-1962 is in respect of Smt. Kamath and the Ex. W-9 dated 19-1-1962 is in respect of Smt. Manjrekar. Regulation 14 says that no person shall be appointed to the service of the Bank unless he has been certified by a qualified medical practitioner approved by the Bank to be of sound constitution and medically fit. The above will also indicate that whatever service was being rendered by Smt. Manjrekar before was on a temporary basis and when the chance of her being absorbed on a permanent footing came she was subjected to detailed medical examination.

11. The waiting list that was prepared as a result of initial test held is Exh. E-8 It shows name of Smt. Kamath (Kum. Shambag) above that of Smt. Manjrekar (Kum. P. L. Haldankar). No doubt there is nothing clear in this document to

show who was senior to whom. But there is evidence and it is the Bank's case that this list was prepared according to the basis of performance of the candidates vide Para. 6 of the statement of claim dated 30-12-1975 of the Bank. The order of confirmation, Ex. W-2 also, no doubt, does not mention as to who is senior and who is junior but it gives sufficient indication because the date of confirmation of Smt. Kamath is earlier to that of Smt. Manjrekar. Regulation 28 clearly lays down that an employee shall ordinarily rank for seniority in his grade according to his date of confirmation in the grade. Therefore, regard being given to the date of confirmation there is no escape from the conclusion that Smt. Kamath must rank senior to Smt. Manjrekar.

12. On behalf of Smt. Manjrekar it was contended that under Regulation 19 these two ladies were on probation and under Regulation 28 seniority will be determined "according to the length of the probationary service." The contention is that Smt. Manjrekar had been on probation since 27-7-1961 whereas Smt. Kamath since 25-1-1962 and as such Smt. Kamath must rank junior to Smt. Manjrekar. Question of seniority on the basis of period of probation cannot be upheld in view of proviso to Regulation 2. It says that the Regulation shall not apply to staff employed temporarily. I have held above that successive extension of service of the two ladies was on temporary basis and, therefore, Regulation 28 cannot be pressed into service on behalf of Smt. Manjrekar.

13. It is also the contention on behalf of Smt. Manjrekar that there was mala fide and unfair labour practice in keeping the name of Smt. Kamath on the waiting list and appointing her when chance came. There are, however, no materials to come to such a conclusion. Reference has already been made of the fact that Smt. Kamath was in the permanent employment and request was made on her behalf for her name being kept on the waiting list and she being absorbed when permanent vacancy rose. The reply that was given by the Respondent is Exh. E-6 dated 8-9-1961. Such a request of hers was accepted and she was informed accordingly. It seems another request was made on her behalf that she will be suitable for clerical post. This request was not, however, accepted. Had the Bank any idea of favouring Smt. Kamath the latter request also could have been easily granted. This fact coupled with absence of materials to substantiate the plea of favouritism, it must be held that whatever was done in regular course of business.

14. For the reasons given above I hold that the action of the Bank in not treating Smt. Manjrekar, senior to Smt. Kamath in the post of Punch Operator is justified and that Smt. Manjrekar is not entitled to any relief. The Reference is answered accordingly.

J. NARAIN, Presiding Officer
[F. No. L-12012/43/74-LR. III-D. II. A.]

S.O. 3171.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Bank of Maharashtra, Poona and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 26th September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-12 of 1977

Employers in relation to the Bank of Maharashtra,
Poona.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For the employers—Shri N. D. Juvekar, Advocate.

For the workman—Shri S. K. Puneekar, President, Bank of Maharashtra Employees' Union.

INDUSTRY : Banking

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, dated the 5th August, 1977

AWARD

Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour by their Order, dated 3rd June, 1977, have referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of Maharashtra Head Office Pune in terminating the services of Shri M. G. Joshi with effect from 12th October, 1976 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

The Parties concerned were directed to file their respective written statements etc., and the matter was fixed for hearing on 29-7-1977 which was adjourned to 5-8-1977 for filing the written statements.

However, at the hearing on 5-8-1977, the parties jointly filed an application stating that the dispute involved in this Reference is amicably settled between them and therefore, the union does not wish to prosecute the Reference further and prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass 'No dispute' award.

Under the circumstances I answer the Reference and make my award accordingly but without any costs.

J. NARAIN, Presiding Officer,
[F. No. L-12012/201/76-D. II. A.]
JAGDISH PRASAD, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

का० आ० 3172.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के पूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3677, तारीख 26 अक्तूबर, 1970 को अधिकांश करने हुए, कोयला खान कल्याण के अपर आयुक्त श्री एच० एच० कुरेशी को, भारत में कोयला-क्षेत्रों के मुख्य निरीक्षक का अधीनस्थ खान-निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए-12026/1/77-एम II]
पी० के० सेन, अपर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

S.O. 3172.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3677, dated the 26th October, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri H. H. Quarishy, Additional Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner to be an Inspector of Mines sub-ordinate to the Chief Inspector for Coalfields in India.

[No. A-12026/1/77-M. II]
P. K. SEN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्तूबर, 1977

का० आ० 3173.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ब्याक्तिक क्षति (प्रतिकार बीमा) स्कीम, 1972 के खण्ड 6 के उपखण्ड (2) के साथ पठित उक्त खण्ड के उपखण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में, उक्त स्कीम के खण्ड 5 के अनुसरण में किसी नियोजक को जारी की गई बीमा पालिसी पर देय कुल प्रीमियम, उसके द्वारा पहले दे दिए गए प्रीमियम के सभी अधिम संवधों के समतुल्य अवधारित करती है।

[सं० एम-19025/17/77-पीक]
ए० यू० शर्मा, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 1977

S.O. 3173.—In pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause 6 of the Personal Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Scheme, 1972, read with sub-clause (2) thereof, the Central Government hereby determines the total premium due on a policy of insurance issued to any employer in pursuance of clause 5 of the said Scheme as the equivalent to all advance payments of premium already made by him.

[No. S-19025/17/71/Fac.]
A. U. SARMA, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 1977

कां० 3174—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जिकिना डे, 3/5 काली प्रसाद चक्रवर्ती लेन हावड़ा-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 दिसम्बर 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जायगी।

[सं० एम० 35017(65)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

New Delhi, the 28th September, 1977

S.O. 3174.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jikina De, 3/5 Kali Prasad Chakraborty Lane, Howrah-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of December, 1975.

[No. S. 35017(65)/77-PF. II]

कां० 3175.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रियन केमिकल कोटिंग (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 8 नगेन्द्र नारायण दत्त रोड, कलकत्ता-29, जिसमें 134, आर०बी० एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-29 स्थित उसका लेखा कार्यालय भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1974 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जायगी।

[सं० एम० 35017(68)/77-पी०एफ०-II(i)]

S.O. 3175.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Riyon Chemical Coating (Private) Limited, 8, Nagendra Narayan Dutta Road, Calcutta-29 including its Accounts Office at 134, R. B. Avenue, Calcutta-29, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1974.

[No. S. 35017/68/77-PF. II(i)]

कां० 3176—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से मैसर्स रियन केमिकल कोटिंग (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 8 नगेन्द्र नारायण दत्त रोड, कलकत्ता-29 जिसमें 134-आर०बी० एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-29 स्थित उसका लेखा कार्यालय भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिश्चित करती है।

[सं० एम० 35017(68)/77-पी०एफ० II(ii)]

S.O. 3176.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of April, 1974 the establishment known as Messrs. Riyon Chemical Coating (Private) Limited, 8, Nagendra Narayan Dutta Road, Calcutta-29 including its Accounts Office at 134, R. B. Avenue, Calcutta-29 for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/68/77-PF. II(ii)]

कां० 3177—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स फाइब्रो प्लास्टिक (इंडिया) (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 3 अम्बिका मुकरजी रोड, कलकत्ता-56 जिसमें 10/1-बी, इन्द्रा राय रोड कलकत्ता-25 स्थित उसका विप्रेम कार्यालय भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 29 फरवरी, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जायगी।

[सं० एम० 35017(70)/77-पी०एफ०-2)]

S.O. 3177.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Fibre Plastichem (India) (Private) Limited, 3, Ambica Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-56 including its Sales office, 10/1-B, Indra Roy Road, Calcutta-25, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the twenty-ninth day of February, 1976.

[No. S. 35017/70/77-P.F. II]

कां० 3178—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स राम प्लास्टिक, 242 अहमदी बागम बहुराम मार्ग, बम्बई-8 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम,

1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी

[सं० एस-35018(75)/77पी०एफ०-II(i)]

S.O. 3178.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the Employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ram Plastics, 242, Jehangir Boman Beharam Marg, Bombay-8, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of December, 1976.

[No. S. 35018/75/77-PF. II(i)]

का०आ०3179.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 से मैसेर्स राम प्लास्टिक्स, 242 जहांगीर बोमन बहराम मार्ग, मुम्बई-8 नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिश्चित करती है ।

[सं० एस-35018(75)/77पी०एफ० II(ii)]

S.O. 3179.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the thirty first day of December, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs Ram Plastics, 242, Jehangir Boman Beharam Marg, Bombay-8, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018/75/77-PF. II(ii)]

का०आ०3180.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसेर्स जेम नट्स एण्ड प्रोड्यूस एक्सपोर्ट कम्पनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 11-ए० नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस, मुम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारबार भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी ।

[सं० एस-35018(77)/77पी०एफ०-II(i)]

S.O. 3180.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Gem Nuts and Produce Exports, Company (Private) Limited, 11-A Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39 including its Associated Concern business at Jamnagar, have agreed

that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1976.

[No. S. 35018/77/77-P.F. II(ii)]

का०आ०3181.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 नवम्बर, 1976 से मैसेर्स जेम नट्स एण्ड प्रोड्यूस एक्सपोर्ट कम्पनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 11-ए०, नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस मुम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारबार भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिश्चित करती है ।

[सं० एस०-35018(77)/77पी०एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3181.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of November, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs. Gem Nuts and Produce Exports Company (Private) Limited, 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39 including its Associated Concern business at Jamnagar, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018/77/77-PF. II(ii)]

का०आ०3182.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसेर्स कोछर टेक्सटाइल्स एक्जीबिशन रोड, पटना नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1974 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी ।

[सं० एस-35019(272)/77पी०एफ०-2(i)]

S.O. 3182.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kochhar Textiles, Exhibition Road, Patna, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952); should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1974.

[No. S. 35019/272/77-PF. II(i)]

का०आ०3183.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 नवम्बर, 1974 से मैसेर्स कोछर

टेक्सटाइल्स, एक्जीबीशन रोड, पटना नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस-35019(272)/77-पी०एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3183.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of November, 1974, the establishment known as Messrs Kochhar Textiles, Exhibition Road, Patna for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/272/77-PF.II(ii)]

का०आ० 3184.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स जनता प्रेस, पोस्ट आफिस, तेजपुर, आसाम नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1974 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(377)/77-पी०एफ-2]

S.O. 3184.—Whereas it appears of the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Janata Press Post Office Tezpur, Assam, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1974.

[No. S. 35019/377/77-PF.II]

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1977

का०आ० 3185.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स पेट्रोकार्बन्स एण्ड केमिकल्स कम्पनी '19 जी' एवरेस्ट हाउस, 46/सी, चौरिखी रोड, कलकत्ता-71 ज़िमें (1) 27 सर, आर० एन० मुखर्जी रोड कलकत्ता और (2) हल्दिया प्रोल्ड रिफाइनरी डाक घर जिला मिर्जापुर पश्चिमी बंगाल स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जुलाई, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35017(41)/77-पी०एफ-2(i)]

New Delhi the 1st October, 1977

S.O. 3185.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Petro-Carbons and Chemicals Company, '19G' Everest House,

46/C, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-71 including its branches at (1) 27, Sir R. N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta and (2) Haldia Old Refinery Post Office District Midnapore, West Bengal have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1975.

[No. S. 35017/41/77-PF.II(i)]

का०आ० 3186.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 जुलाई, 1975 से मेसर्स पेट्रोकार्बन्स एण्ड केमिकल्स कम्पनी, '19जी' एवरेस्ट हाउस, 46/सी, चौरिखी रोड कलकत्ता-71 ज़िमें (1) 27, सर आर० एन० मुखर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता और (2) हल्दिया प्रोल्ड रिफाइनरी डाकघर जिला मिर्जापुर, पश्चिमी बंगाल स्थित इसकी शाखाएं भी सम्मिलित हैं, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस-35017(41)/77-पी०एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3186.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of July, 1975 the establishment known as Messrs Petro-Carbons and Chemicals Company, '19G' Everest House, 46/C, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-71 including its branches at (1) 27, Sir R. N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta and (2) Haldia Old Refinery Post Office District Midnapore, West Bengal, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/41/77-PF.II(ii)]

का०आ० 3187.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स फरीदाबाद इन्वेस्टमेंट्स कम्पनी लिमिटेड, 16, इन्दिया एक्सचेंज प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 सितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35017(58)/77-पी०एफ-2(i)]

S.O. 3187.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Faridabad Investments Company Limited, 16, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S. 35017/58/77-PF.II(i)]

क्र०आ० 3188.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी अधिपत्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के धारा 6 के पथ पर परन्तु द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने आबन्धक जाच करने के पश्चात् 1 सितम्बर, 1976 से लागू करने के लिए इन्डिया एक्चेंज प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1 नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तु के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करने है।

[नं० एम-35017(58)/77-पी०एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3188.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of September, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs Faridabad Investments Company Limited, 16, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/58/77-PF.II(ii)]

क्र०आ० 3189.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड इन्डस्ट्रियल मैनुफैक्चर्स, 1, लिन्डसे स्ट्रीट, (टॉप फ्लोर) कलकत्ता-16 जिसमें 16, मंदोल टेम्पल लेन: कलकत्ता-53 स्थित उसकी शाखा भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी अधिपत्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[नं० एम-35017(61)/77-पी०एफ-2]

S.O. 3189.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Associated Industrial Manufacturers, 1, Lindsay Street, (Top Floor), Calcutta-16, including its branch at 16, Mandol Temple Lane, Calcutta-53, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1976.

[No. S. 35017/61/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3190.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दीपिका एन्टरप्राइज, 33/1, नार्थ तोपमिया रोड, कलकत्ता-46, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी अधिपत्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[नं० एम-35017(62)/77-पी०एफ-2]

S.O. 3190.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Dipika Enterprise, 33/1, North Topsia Road, Calcutta-46 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1976.

[No. S. 35017/62/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3191.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स यूनिवर्सल टैनिंग इण्डस्ट्रीज, 5-ईश्वर मण्डल लेन, कलकत्ता-46, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी अधिपत्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 दिसम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[नं० एम-35017(63)/77-पी०एफ-2]

S.O. 3191.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as M/s. Universal Tanning Industries, 5 Iswar Mondal Lane, Calcutta-700046 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of December, 1975.

[No. S-35017(63)/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3192.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स आर्कटिक इण्डिया, 198, ब्लॉक-जे, न्यू अलिपुर, कलकत्ता-53 जिसमें 20, राजपुर रोड, दिल्ली-6 स्थित उसकी शाखा भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी अधिपत्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[नं० एम-35017(69)/77-पी०एफ-2(i)]

S.O. 3192.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Arctic India, 198, Block-J, New Alipur, Calcutta-53 including its branch at 20, Rajpur Road, Delhi-6, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1976.

[No. S. 35017(69)/77-PF.II(i)]

क्र० आ० 3193—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 अप्रैल, 1976 से मैसर्स आर्क्टिक इण्डिया, 198, व्यास 'जे' न्यू अलीपुर, कलकत्ता-53, जिसमें 20, राजपुर रोड, दिल्ली-6 स्थित उसकी शाखा भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करना है।

[सं. एम-35017(69)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3193—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of April, 1976, the establishment known as Messrs. Arctic India, 198, 'J' New Alipur, Calcutta-53 including its branch at 20, Raipur Road, Delhi-6, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017(69)/77-PF.II(ii)]

क्र० आ० 3194—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स हिन्दिन कम्प्यूटर्स सिस्टम्स एण्ड कंसल्टेंट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड 69-ए लावा जगमोहनदास मार्ग, मुम्बई-6, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 अगस्त, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम-35018(70)/77-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 3194—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Hindion Computers Systems and Consultants (Private) Limited, 69-A, Jagmohandas Marg, Bombay-6, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of August, 1976.

[No. S. 35018/70/77-PF.II]

क्र० आ० 3195—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि बाइन्डवेल-108 हीरेन लाइट इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, मुगल लान, माहिम, मुम्बई-16, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और

प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 अगस्त, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम-35018(71)/77-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 3195—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Bindwel, 108, Hiren Light Industrial Estate, Mogul Lane, Mahim, Bombay-16, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of August, 1975.

[No. S. 35018/71/77-PF.II]

क्र० आ० 3196—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जमनादास एण्ड सन्स, 11-ए, नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस, मुम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारखाना भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम-35018(76)/77-पी० एफ-2(i)]

S.O. 3196—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jamnadas and Sons, 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39, including its Associated Concerns Business at Jamnagar, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1976.

[No. S. 35018(76)/77-PF.II(i)]

क्र० आ० 3197—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 नवम्बर, 1976 से मैसर्स जमनादास एण्ड सन्स, 11-ए, नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस, मुम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारखाना भी है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं. एम-35018(76)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3197.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of November, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs Jamnadas and Sons 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39, including its Associated Concerns business at Jamnagar for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018(76)/77-PF.II(ii)]

क्रा० आ० 3198 :—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एन० यू० टी० सी० धो०, 11-ए, नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस, बम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारखाना भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35018(78)/77-पी० एफ-2 (i)]

S.O. 3198.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs NUTCO, 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39, including its Associated Business concern at Jamnagar, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1976.

[No. S. 35018(78)/77-PF.II(i)]

क्रा० आ० 3199 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 नवम्बर, 1977 से मैसर्स एन० यू० टी० सी० धो०, 11-ए, नाथालाल डी० पारिख मार्ग, तन्ना हाउस, बम्बई-39 जिसमें जामनगर स्थित उसका सहयुक्त सम्पूक्त कारखाना भी सम्मिलित है।

नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस०-35018(78)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3199.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of November, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs NUTCO, 11-A, Nathalal Parikh Marg, Tanna House, Bombay-39, including its Associated Business concern at Jamnagar, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018(78)/77-PF.II(ii)]

क्रा० आ० 3200 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (ग) के अनुसरण में डा० राम कृपाल सिंह, अम तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री, को श्री जगन्नाथ पट्टाभिया के स्थान पर कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के अम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का० आ० संख्या 1517 तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में (केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (ग) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट) शीर्षक के नीचे मव 3 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“डा० राम कृपाल सिंह,
अम तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री,
भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली।”

[सं० यू०-16012/5/77-एच० आई० (i)]

S.O. 3200.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of clause (c) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha, Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour and Parliamentary Affairs as a Member of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri Jagannath Pahadia;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the Central Government under clause (c) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 3, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha,
Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour and
Parliamentary Affairs,
Government of India, New Delhi.”

[No. U-16012/5/77-HI(i)]

क्रा० आ० 3201 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (ग) के अनुसरण में श्री के० आर० बालिगा के स्थान पर श्री एस० वासुदेवन, अमर सचिव, भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 39) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के अम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1517, तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, “(केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (ग) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मव 7 की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी :—

“श्री एस० वासुदेवन,
अमर सचिव,
भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय,
नई दिल्ली।”

[सं० यू०-16012(10)/76-एच० आई०]

S.O. 3201.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of clause (c) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri S. Vasudevan, Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, as a member of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri K. R. Baliga;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "(Nominated by the Central Government under clause (c) of section 4)", for the entry against item 7, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Shri S. Vasudevan,
Additional Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Finance,
New Delhi".

[No. U-16012/10/76-HI]

का० आ० 3202.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स किशोर टेक्स्टाइल सी/16, उद्योगनगर नवसारी, जिला बुलार नामक स्थापन में सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35019(107)/76-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 3202.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kishore Textile, C/16, Udhogynagar, Navasari, District Bulsar, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of December, 1975.

[No. S. 35019/107/76-PF.II]

का० आ० 3203.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स भवानी लाइट्स सी-डी 3, जी० आइ० डी० सी०, गुड्डे, बुलसर, जिनमें 211-डी, डा० अम्बेडकर मार्ग, लिलावती भवन, तृतीय मंजिल, मटुंगा, मुम्बई-19 स्थित उसकी शाखा भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन में सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35019(192)/77-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 3203.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Bhavani Lights, D.D. 3 G.I. D.C., Guindlay, Bulsar, including its branch at 211-D, Dr. Ambedkar Road, Lilavati Building 2nd Floor, Matunga, Bombay-400019, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of December, 1976.

[No. S-35019 (192)/77-PF.II]

का० आ० 3204.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स नबीबख्श स्टेट पेन्सिल वर्क्स, नई आबादी, मन्दसौर (मध्य प्रदेश) नामक स्थापन में सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 मार्च, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35019(303)/77-पी० एफ-2(i)]

S.O. 3204.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Nabibux Rahimbux State Pencil Works, Naiabadi, Mandasaur (Madhya Pradesh), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of March, 1977.

[No. S-35019(303)/77-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3205.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 31 मार्च 1977 में मैसर्स नबीबख्श स्टेट पेन्सिल वर्क्स, नई आबादी, मन्दसौर (मध्य प्रदेश) नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019(303)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3205.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the thirty-first day of March, 1977, the establishment known as Messrs Nabibux Rahimbux State Pencil Works, Naiabadi, Mandasaur (Madhya Pradesh), for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S-35019(303)/77-PF. II (ii)]

क्रा० आ० 3206:—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मेट्रो एजेंसीज, बनर्जी रोड, एर्नाकुलम, कोचीन-18 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 मई, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(331)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3206.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Metro Agencies, Banerji Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-18, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of May, 1977.

[No. S-35019(331)/77-PF. II(i)]

क्रा० आ० 3207:—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करते के पश्चात् 31 मई, 1977 से मैसर्स मेट्रो एजेंसीज, बनर्जी रोड, एर्नाकुलम कोचीन-18 नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम०-35019(331)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3207.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the 31st day of May, 1977 the establishment known as Messrs. Metro Agencies, Banerji Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-18, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S-35019(331)/77-PF. II(ii)]

क्रा० आ० 3208:—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एम० के० इण्डस्ट्रीज, बकरम, मुशीराबाद, हैदराबाद नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 30 जून, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(337)/77-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 3208.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs S.K. Industries, Bakaram, Musheerabad, Hyderabad, have agreed that the

provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of June, 1975.

[No. S-35019(337)/77-PF. II]

क्रा० आ० 3209:—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दीपक एंटरप्राइजेस, नेत्रवती भवन, बलभट्टा मार्ग, मंगलौर-1 जिसमें (1) नेहरू नगर, डाकघर कबाका, प्रतुर (एम०के०), (2) डाका रजिस्ट्रार-विभाग (एम०के०) श्री आदिमार्ग, मार्ग, उप्पीनंगडी, (एम०के०) 7(A) चर्वमार्ग, बेल्यांगडी (एम०के०) (5) मुख्य मार्ग मनी (एम०के०) और (6) डाक कोलनाद सालेथुर (एम०के०) स्थित उसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(338)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3209.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Deepak Enterprises, Nethravathi Building, Balmatta Road, Mangalore-1 including its branches at (1) Nehru Nagar, Post Office Kabaka, Puttar (S.K.), (2) Post Office Mitul Vittal (S.K.), (3) Shriadi Road, Uppinangady, (S.K.) (4) Church Road, Belthangady, (S.K.) (5) Main Road Mani (S.K.) and (6) Post Kolnad, Salethur (S.K.) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1975.

[No. S-35019(338)/77-PF. II(i)]

क्रा० आ० 3210:—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करते के पश्चात् 1 अप्रैल, 1975 से मैसर्स दीपक एंटरप्राइजेस, नेत्रवती भवन, बलभट्टा मार्ग, मंगलौर-1 जिसमें (1) नेहरू नगर, डाकघर, कबाका प्रतुर (एम०के०) (2) डाकघर मिटल-वितल (एम०के०) श्री आदिमार्ग उप्पीनंगडी (एम०के०) (4) चर्वमार्ग बेल्यांगडी (एम०के०), (5) मुख्यमार्ग मनी (एम०के०) और (6) डाकघर कोलनाद, सालेथुर (एम०के०) स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं। नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम०-35019(338)/77-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3210.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government after making necessary enough into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of April, 1975 the establishment known as Messrs. Deepak Enterprises, Nethravathi Building, Balmatta Road, Mangalore-1 including its branches at (1) Nehru Nagar, Post Office Kabaka, Puttar (S.K.), (2) Post Office Vittal, Vittal (S.K.) (3) Shriadi Road Uppinawady (S.K.) (4) Church Road, Belthangady (S.K.), (5) Main Road, Mani (S.K.), (6) Post Koland, Salethur (S.K.) for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S-35019/338/77-PF. II(ii)]

क्र० आ० 3211.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स म्यूल केमिकल्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 17क, औद्योगिक उपनगर, तुमकुर मार्ग बंगलूर-22, जिसमें द्वितीय मंजिल, हमाम हाऊस, अम्बाला जोशी मार्ग, मुम्बई-23 स्थित उसकी शाखा भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(341)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3211.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Myul Chemicals (Private) Limited, 17A, Industrial Suburb, Tumkur Road, Bangalore-22 including its branch at 1st Floor, Halmam, House, Ambalal Doshi Marg, Bombay-23 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1977.

[No. S-35019/341/77-PF. II]

क्र० आ० 3212.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स केल्ट्रॉन रेसिस्टर्स लिमिटेड, पोस्ट बॉक्स सं० 37, मिल रोड, कन्नानूर-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जुलाई, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(342)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3212.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Keltron Resistors Limited, Post Box No. 37, Mill Road, Cannanore-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Pro-

vident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1977.

[No. S-35019/342/77-PF. II]

क्र० आ० 3213.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री हरी टेक्सटाइल्स, दलूरु (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 सितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(344)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3213.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sri Hari Textiles, Fluru (Andhra Pradesh), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S-35019(344)/77-PF. II]

क्र० आ० 3214.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री श्रीनिवास टेक्सटाइल्स, दलूरु (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 सितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35019(346)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3214.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sri Srinivasa Textiles, Eluru, (Andhra Pradesh), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central

Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/346/77-PF, II]

क्र० आ० 3215.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दी राउरकेला सायं कालीन महाविद्यालय, राउरकेला, सुन्दरगढ़, जिला उड़ीसा नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35019(349)/77-पी०एफ०-2(i)]

S.O. 3215.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as The Rourkela Evening College, Rourkela, Sundargarh, District Orissa have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1976.

[No. S-35019(349)/77-PF, II(i)]

क्र० आ० 3216.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 नवम्बर, 1976 से दी राउरकेला सायंकालीन महाविद्यालय, राउरकेला, सुन्दरगढ़, जिला उड़ीसा नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019(349)/77-पी०एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3216.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of November, 1976 the establishment known as The Rourkela Evening College, Rourkela, Sundergarh, Distt. Orissa, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S-35019(349)/77-PF, II(ii)]

क्र० आ० 3217.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री निवास एन्युमिनियम रोलिंग मिल्स एण्ड मेटल वर्क्स, इन्डस्ट्रियल स्टेट, विशाखापत्तनम-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 सितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35019(351)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3217.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Srinivasa Aluminium Rolling Mills and Metal Works, Industrial Estate, Visakhapatnam-I have agreed that the provisions of Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S. 35019(351)/77-PF, II]

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्तूबर, 1977

क्र० आ० 3218.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता कि मैसर्स लेक्कान इन्स्ट्रूमेंट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड 57/15, बालगंज मर्कुर रोड, कलकत्ता-19 जिसमें 138छ, पिकनिक गार्डन मार्ग कलकत्ता-39 स्थित उसकी कारखाना सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जुलाई, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-35017(59)/77-पी०एफ०-II(i)]

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 1977

S.O. 3218.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Levcon Instruments (Private) Limited, 57/15, Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta-19 including its factory at 138G, Picnic Garden Road, Calcutta-39, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1976.

[No. S. 35017/59/77-PF, II(i)]

क्र० आ० 3219.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 जुलाई, 1976 से मैसर्स लेक्कान इन्स्ट्रूमेंट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 57/15, बालगंज मर्कुर रोड कलकत्ता-19, जिसमें 138-छ, पिकनिक गार्डन मार्ग, कलकत्ता-39 स्थित उसकी कारखाना सम्मिलित है नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017(59)/77-पी०एफ०-II(ii)]

S.O. 3219.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of July,

1976 the establishment known as Messrs Levcon Instruments (Private) Limited, 57/15, Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta-19 including its factory at 138G, Picnic Garden Road, Calcutta-39, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/59/77-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3220.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स राज टी एण्ड प्लांटेशन लिमिटेड 4 इंडिया एक्सचेंज प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 28 फरवरी, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35017(60)/77-पी०एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3220.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Raj Tea and Plantations Limited, 4, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the twenty-eighth day of February, 1975.

[No. S. 35017(60)/77-PF-II(i)]

का० आ० 3221.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 28 फरवरी, 1975 से मैसर्स राज टी एण्ड प्लांटेशन लिमिटेड, 4 इंडिया एक्सचेंज प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम०-35017(60). 77-पी०एफ०-2 (ii)]

S.O. 3221.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the twenty-eighth day of February, 1975 the establishment known as Messrs. Raj Tea and Plantations Limited, 4, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/60/77-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3222.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सैनिटरी मिडीकेट (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड 2/बी, कालीघाट मार्ग, कलकत्ता-25 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जुलाई, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35017(64)/77-पी०एफ०-2(i)]

S.O. 3222.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sanitary Syndicate (Private) Limited, 2/B, Kalighat Road, Calcutta-25, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1975.

[No. S. 35017(64)/77-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3223.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 जुलाई, 1975 से मैसर्स सैनिटरी मिडीकेट (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 2/बी, कालीघाट मार्ग, कलकत्ता-25 नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम०-35017(64)/77-पी०एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3223.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of July, 1975 the establishment known as Messrs Sanitary Syndicate (Private) Limited, 2/B, Kalighat Road, Calcutta-7000025 for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017(64)/77-PF. II (ii)]

का० आ० 3224.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कौन्सिल एयरवेज लिमिटेड ओबरोय गैंगवनहोटल एफ, 101, एच० सी० नारिमनपॉइन्ट, मुम्बई नामक स्थापन से जगमें (1) सं० 1 होटल, जनपथ नई दिल्ली, (2) होटल हिन्दुस्तान इन्टरनेशनल 255/1, ब्राबार्थ जगदीश बोस रोड कलकत्ता-20 (3) कल्लेसारा होटल नापिंग आरकोडे, मद्रास स्थित उसकी शाखाएं भी हैं, सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अगस्त, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(19)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3224.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as M/s. Qantas Airway Limited, Oberoi Sheraton Hotel F 101, H. C. Nariman Point, Bombay including its branches at (1) No. 1, Hotel Janpath, New Delhi (2) Hotel Hindustan International, 235/1, Acharya

Jagdish Bose Road, Calcutta-700020 and (3) Connemara Hotel Shopping Arcade, Madras have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of August, 1976.

[No. S-35018(19)/77-PF II]

का० आ० 3225.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इन्टरनेशनल एक्सपोर्ट्स एण्ड एस्टेट एजेंसी, टन्ना हाउस, 11-ए, नाथलाला दी० पारेख मार्ग मुम्बई-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 अक्तूबर, 1973 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(61)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3225.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs International Exports and Estate Agency, Tanna House, 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Bombay-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of October, 1973.

[No. S. 35018/61/77-P.F.II]

का० आ० 3226.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स टन्ना एक्सपोर्ट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, टन्ना हाउस-1, 71-ए, नाथलाला दी० पारेख मार्ग मुम्बई-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 अक्तूबर, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(63)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3226.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Tanna Exporters (Private) Limited, Tanna House, 11-A, Nathalal D. Parikh Marg, Bombay-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of October, 1973.

[No. S. 35018/63/77-PF. II]

का० आ० 3227.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एवकॉन इलेक्ट्रोमेशन, 229-यूनिफ़ ओब्लिगिफ एस्टेट, बी० एम० मार्ग मुम्बई-25 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(60)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3227.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Avcon Electromotion 229, Unique Industrial Estate, V. S. Marg, Bombay-25, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment; Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of December, 1975.

[No. S. 35018(66)/77 PF.II]

का० आ० 3228.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स महेंद्र हाइब्रिड सीड्स कम्पनी महावीर मार्ग, पोस्ट बॉक्स सं० 42, जलाना नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मार्च, 1974 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(72)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3228.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Mahendra Hybrid Seeds Company, Mahavir Marg, Post Box No. 52, Jalana, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of March, 1974.

[No. S. 35018(72)/77-PF. II]

कां०आ० 3229.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सारंग इण्डस्ट्रीज, ए-78 मार्ग सं० 16 वागले औद्योगिक सम्पदा थाना नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 30 अक्टूबर 1973 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(73)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3229.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sarang Industries, A-78, Road No. 16, Wagle Industrial Estate, Thana, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of April, 1973.

[No. S. 35018(73)/77-PF. II]

कां०आ० 3230.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एशियन प्लास्टिक्स, 17/19 युनीक इण्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट और सावरकर मार्ग, प्रभा देवी, मुम्बई-25 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अक्टूबर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम०-35018(74)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3230.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Asian Plastics, 17/19, Unique Industrial Estate, Veer Savarkar Marg, Prabha-devi, Bombay-25, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of October, 1976.

[No. S. 35018/74/77-PF. II]

कां०आ० 3231.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स नीलकण्ठानन्द एण्ड ब्रदर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, सं० 9, ग्रेज गेट मार्ग मद्रास-18 जिसमें (1) पत्तममुदुर (2) रामास्वामी राजा नगर

(3) तिरुनेलवेली मेलविनगर, गिघ मुद्राय (4) पल्लवरम और (5) मन्द्यम, स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1902 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019(101)/75-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3231.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Nilkantan and Brothers Constructions (Private) Limited, No. 9, Murray's Gate Road, Madras-18 including its branches at (1) Pattampudur, (2) Ramaswamyraja Nagar (3) Tirunveli (Selvinagar, Sindhupondurai) (4) Pallavaram and (5) Mandapam, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1975.

[No. S. 35019/101/75-PF. II]

कां०आ० 3232.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 7 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात्, 1 जनवरी 1975 से मैसर्स नीलकण्ठानन्द एण्ड ब्रदर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, सं० 9 ग्रेज गेट मार्ग, मद्रास-18 जिसमें (1) पत्तममुदुर (2) रामा स्वामी राजा नगर (3) तिरुनेलवेली मेल विनगर (गिघ मुद्राय) (4) पल्लवरम और (5) मन्द्यम, स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिये विनिश्चित करती है।

[सं० एम० 35019(101)/75-पी० एफ० 2(ii)]

S.O. 3232.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of January, 1975 the establishment known as Messrs Nilkantan and Brothers Constructions (Private) Limited, No. 9, Murray's Gate Road, Madras-18 including its branches at (1) Pattampudur, (2) Ramaswamyraja Nagar (3) Tirunelveli (Selvinagar, Sindhupondurai) (4) Pallavaram and (5) Mundapam for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/101/75-PF. II(ii)]

कां०आ० 3233.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स राजू टेक्स्टाइल्स, C/16 उद्योग नगर, नवमारी जिला बृहन्नर, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(108)/76-पी०एफ०]

S.O. 3233.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Raju Textiles, C/16, Udhoyanagar, Navsari, District Bulsar have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of December, 1975.

[No. S-35019(108)/76-PF. II]

क्र० आ० 3234.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जयभारती होटल तेल्लीचेरी तालुक कानानोर जिल्हा नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस० 35019(314)/77-पी०एफ० 2]

S.O. 3234.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jayabharathi Hotel, Tellicherry, Tellicherry Taluk, Cannanore District, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1977.

[No. S. 35019/314/77-PF. II]

क्र०आ० 3235.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सीधी कुमार इलेक्ट्रिकल्स इंजीनियरिंग एण्ड कन्ट्रैक्टर न्यू माडिवाला प्रोविडेंट फंड, माडिवाला, बंगलूर-29 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(316)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3235.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Satis Kumar Electrical Engineering and Contractor, New Madiwala Extension, Madiwala, Bangalore-29, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1977.

[No. S. 35019/316/77-PF. II]

क्र० आ० 3236.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एस० गरीरखा करीम बीडी कन्ट्रैक्टर नैपनी (बेलगाँव जिला) नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जुलाई, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(317)/77- पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3236.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs S. Garrakhan Karim Bidi Contractors, Nippani (Belgaum District), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1975.

[No. S. 35019/317/77-PF. II]

क्र०आ० 3237.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स साइंटिफिक मीटर्स, रोड सं० 13, बवारा मिल्स हैदराबाद नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिये ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(319)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3237.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Scientific Meters, Road No. 13, Bawara Mills, Hyderabad, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1975.

[No. S. 35019(319)/77-PF. II]

क्र०आ० 3238.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स गीथा नर्सिंग होम सं० 160, वानी विलास रोड, बासवानागुडी, बंगलूर नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मिनम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(321)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3238.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Geetha Nursing Home No. 160, Vani Villasa Road, Basavanagudi, Bangalore, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S-35019(321)/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3239.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स हाजी अकारिया हाजी इब्राहीम, मेन रोड, काकीनाडा, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 दिसम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(324)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3239.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employers and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Haji Jakaria Haji Ebrahim, Main Road, Kakinada, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of December, 1976.

[No. S-35019(324)/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3240.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स प्रीमियर एनालिटिकल लैबोरेटरी, बेम्बालगी बिल्डिंग, गनपत गली, बेम्बालगी, जिसमें (1) लोण्डा (जिला बेम्बालगी) और (2) पटेलनगर होस्पेट (जिला बेम्बालगी) स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं; नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और

(जिला बेम्बालगी) स्थित इसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं; नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अक्तूबर, 1971 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019(333)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3240.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Premier Analytical Laboratory, Bembalgi Building, Ganpatgalli, Belgaum including its branches at (i) Londa (District Belgaum) and (2) Patel Nagar, Hospeth (District Bellary), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of October, 1971.

[No. S. 35019(333)/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3241.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मिनी मशीन टूल्स, एम०एम० औद्योगिक एस्टेट, येदीयूर, बंगलूर-11 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 मई, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(336)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3241.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Mini Machine Tools, M. M. Industrial Estate, Yedyur, Bangalore-11, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of May, 1977.

[No. S. 35019(336)/77-PF.II]

क्र०आ० 3242.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स नागार्जुन फर्टिलाइजर्स लिमिटेड, मार्ग सं० 7, बन्जारा हिल्स, हैदराबाद-34 जिसमें इसकी (1) एल-7 साउथ एक्सटेंशन, भाग-2 नई दिल्ली-49 और (2) भूतपूर्व इसो भवन, पोर्ट एरिया, काकीनाडा-7 स्थित उसकी शाखाएं सम्मिलित हैं; नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और

कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(340)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3242.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Nagarjuna Fertilisers Limited, Road No. 7, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad-34, including its branch at (1) L-7, South Extension, Part II New Delhi-49 and (2) Ex-ESSO Building, Port Area, Kakinada-7, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1976.

[No. S. 35019(340)/77-PF. II]

का०आ० 3243 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सैमर्स आन्ध्र पेंट्स एण्ड केमिकल इन्डस्ट्रीज, सी-54 (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड इन्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, बालानगर, हैदराबाद नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(347)/77-पी०एफ०-2(i)]

S.O. 3243.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Andhra Paints and Chemical Industries, C-54, (Private) Assisted Industrial Estate, Balanagar, Hyderabad, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/347/77-PF.II(i)]

का०आ० 3244 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 मई, 1976 से सैमर्स आन्ध्र पेंट्स एण्ड केमिकल इन्डस्ट्रीज, सी-54 (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड इन्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, बालानगर हैदराबाद नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिये विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम-35019(347)/77-पी०एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3244.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of May, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs Andhra Paints and Chemical Industries, C-54, (Private) Assisted Industrial Estate, Balanagar, Hyderabad, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019(347)/77-PF. II(ii)]

का०आ० 3245 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सैमर्स श्री वेन्कटेश्वर क्लॉथ प्रोडक्शन्स, एलुरु (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 गितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(348)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3245.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Sri Venkateswara Cloth productions, Eluru (Andhra Pradesh), have agreed that the provisions of Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1976.

[No. S-35019(348)/77-PF. III]

का०आ० 3246 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सैमर्स कुमारन मैच इन्डस्ट्रीज, 167, 168 थालायथम बाजार, गुडियाट्टम, एन० ए० नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(357)/77-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3246.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as M/s. Kumaran Match Industries, 167, 168, Thalayatham Bazar, Gudiyattam, N.A., have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, 1976.

[No. S-35019(357)/77-PF. II]

कां० आ० 3247.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सिगापुरी गिल्क मिल्स, मलाप्रतपुरा, बेगमवाडी, सूरत नामक स्थापन से जिसमें प्लॉट सं० 99/103, उधना, उद्योगनगर, उधना, जिला सूरत स्थित उसकी जाया भी सम्मिलित है, सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 30 सितम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019(481)/76-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 3247.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Singapuri Silk Mills, Salabatpura, Begamwadi, Surat including its branch at Plot No. 99/103, Udhna, Udyognagar, Udhna, District Surat, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of September, 1976.

[No. S-35019(481)/76-PF. II]

का० आ० 3248.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या 1517 तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, “(धारा 4 के खण्ड (i) के अधीन संसद् द्वारा निर्वाचित)” शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत श्रम संख्या 42 और 43 और उनमें सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित श्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टियाँ, प्रतिस्थापित की जाएंगी, अर्थात्:—

“12. श्री के० रामामूर्ति, संसद् सदस्य
(लोक सभा सदस्य)

93, नार्थ एवेन्यू,
नई दिल्ली-1.

(स्थायी पता:

69, डा० सुब्बारायन रोड, सेलम-636001, तमिलनाडु)।

43. श्री उग्रसेन, सगद् सदस्य,
(लोक सभा सदस्य)

170, गाउथ एवेन्यू, नई दिल्ली
(स्थायी पता:

जनता पार्टी कार्यालय,

गहरपाल, देवरिया,

उत्तर प्रदेश)।”

[सं० यू०-16012/4/77-एच०आई०]

S.O. 3248.—In pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517 dated the 14th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Elected by Parliament under clause (i) of section 4)”, for Serial Numbers 42 and 43 and the entries relating thereto, the following Serial Numbers and entries shall be substituted, namely:—

“42. Shri K. Ramamurthy, M.P. (Member of Lok Sabha) 93, North Avenue, New Delhi.
(Permanent Address :
69, Dr. Subbarayan Road. Salem-636001, Tamil Nadu).

43. Shri Ugrasen, M.P., (Member of Lok Sabha) 170, South Avenue, New Delhi.
(Permanent Address :

Janta Party Office, Garur Pal, Deoria, Uttar Pradesh)”.]

[No. U-16012/4/77-HI]

का० आ० 3249.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव, स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री को श्री ए० के० एम० इनाक, के स्थान पर कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के उपाध्यक्ष के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1517 तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(उपाध्यक्ष)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 2 के मामले की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव,
स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय
में राज्य मंत्री,
भारत सरकार,
नई दिल्ली।”

[संख्या यू०-16012/5/77-एच०आई०]

S.O. 3249.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of clause (b) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri Jagdambi Prasad Yadav, Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare as the Vice-Chairman of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri A.K.M. Ishaque;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Vice-chairman)”, for the entry against item 2, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Shri Jagdambi Prasad Yadav, Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, New Delhi.”

[No. U-16012/5/77-HI]

का० आ० 3250.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 8 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में डा० राम कृष्ण विद्, श्रम तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री, को श्री जगन्नाथ पट्टाभैया के स्थान पर कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के स्थायी समिति के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी, राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 8 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम

मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०भा० 477 (ई०) तारीख 16 जुलाई, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा धारा 8 के खण्ड (क) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 1 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“डा० राम कृपाल सिंह,

श्रम तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री,

भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली।”

[सं० यू०-16012/5/77-एच० आई०]

S.O. 3250.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of clause (a) of section 8 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha, Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour and Parliamentary Affairs as the chairman of the Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri Jagannath Pahadia;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 8 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 477(E) dated the 16th July, 1976 namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the Central Government under clause (a) of section 8)”, for the entry against item 1, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha, Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour and Parliamentary Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi”.

[No. U-16012/5/77-HI]

कां०भा० 3251.—गुजरात राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में श्रीमती एस० एल० सिंगला के स्थान पर श्री एस० एच० जगद, सचिव, गुजरात सरकार, स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग के कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०भा० 1517, तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद II के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“श्री एस० एच० जगद,

सचिव, गुजरात सरकार,

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग,

गांधी नगर।”

[संख्या यू० 16012/7/76-एच० आई०]

S.O. 3251.—Whereas the State Government of Gujarat has in pursuance of clause (d) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri S.H. Jagad, Secretary to the Government of Gujarat, Health and Family Welfare Department to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Smt. S. L. Singla;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification

of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the State Governments under clause (d) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 11, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“Shri S. H. Jagad, Secretary to the Government of Gujarat, Health and Family Welfare Department, Gandhinagar”.

No. U-16012/7/76-HI]

कां०भा० 3252.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 8 के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में, श्री के० आर० बालिगा के स्थान पर श्री एस० वासुदेवन, अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम की स्थायी समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 8 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०भा० 477(क), तारीख 16 जुलाई, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, “(केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा धारा 8 खण्ड (ख) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 4 की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी :—

“श्री एस० वासुदेवन,

अपर सचिव, भारत सरकार,

वित्त मंत्रालय,

नई दिल्ली।”

[सं० यू०-16012(10)/76-एच० आई०]

S.O. 3252.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of clause (b) of section 8 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri S. Vasudevan, Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, as a member of the Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri K. R. Baliga;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 477(E), dated the 16th July, 1976, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the Central Governments under clause (b) of section 8)”, for the entry against item 4, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“Shri S. Vasudevan, Additional Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi.”

[No. U-16012/10/76-HI]

कां०भा० 3253.—प्रसम राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (ज) के अनुसरण में श्री ए० के० सैकिया के स्थान पर श्री आर० एन० मुहुरी सचिव, प्रसम सरकार, श्रम विभाग, डिमपुर को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है,

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के श्रम

संस्थान की अधिसूचना संख्या का०आ० 1517, तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 9 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“श्री आर० एन० मुहुरी,
सचिव, अमम सरकार,
अम विभाग,
डिसपुर।”

[संख्या यु० 16012/16/76-एच०आई०]

S.O. 3253.—Whereas the State Government of Assam has, in pursuance of clause (d) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri R. N. Muhuri, Secretary to the Government of Assam, Labour Department, Dispur to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation in place of Shri A. K. Saikia;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Govt. hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517 dated the 14th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the State Government under clause (d) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 9, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Shri R. N. Muhuri, Secretary to the Government of Assam, Labour Department, Dispur”.

[No. U-16012/16/76-HI]

का०आ० 3254.—राजस्थान राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में श्री राम० के० जोशी के स्थान पर श्री विजय मिश्र, अमायुक्त, राजस्थान सरकार, जयपुर को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के अम संस्थान की अधिसूचना संख्या का०आ० 1517, तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 23 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“श्री विजय मिश्र,
अमायुक्त, राजस्थान सरकार
जयपुर।”

[संख्या यु० 16012/18/76-एच०आई०]

एम० एस० सहस्रनामन उप सचिव

S.O. 3254.—Whereas the State Government of Rajasthan has, in pursuance of clause (d) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri Brijendra Singh, Labour Commissioner, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur, to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation in place of Shri N. K. Joshi;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517 dated the 14th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the State Governments under clause (d) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 23, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Shri Brijendra Singh, Labour Commissioner, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur”.

[No. U-16012/18/76-HI]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 4th October, 1977

S.O. 3255.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Messrs Menlyn & Co., Bombay and 14 other watchmen contractors, and their workmen; which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-22 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in Relation to the Watchmen Contractors

1. M/s. Menlyn & Co., Prestige Chambers, 4th Floor, Kalyan Street, Bombay-400 009,
2. M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons, Nanbhoy Mansion, 2nd Floor, Gunbow Street, Bombay-400 001.
3. M/s. Nasareth Services, 47, Mint Road, Fort, Bombay-400001.
4. M/s. Ebrahim Taqi, 11, Dossa House, Gunbow Street, Bombay-400001.
5. M/s. Sunder Simon, New Dilkush Laundry, 28, Old Modi Street, Bombay-400001.
6. M/s. K. Roshan Khan & Sons, 15, Goa Street, Room No. 135, Bombay-400038.
7. M/s. A. S. Jagirdar, Usha Kiron Building, Ground Floor, Flat No. 3, 2nd Pasts Lane, Colaba, Bombay-400005.
8. M/s. Mohamad Hanif Sk. Abubakar, Geb. Mohd. Building, Hains Road, Byculia, Bombay-40011.
9. M/s. Safia Shaikh Abdul Latif, Shivaji Building, 3rd Floor, 50, Samuel Street, Bombay-400009.
10. M/s. M. Gani, New Dilsukh Laundry, 28, Old Modi Street, Fort, Bombay-400001.
11. M/s. Khimji Ranchodji, 243, P. D'Mello Road, Bombay-400038.
12. M/s. Madhu Verappa, 16, Kumptle Street, 4th Floor, Room No. 38, Fort, Bombay-400038.
13. M/s. Subratikhan & Sons, 21, Nariman Building, Room No. 10, Mangalore Street, Bombay 400038.
14. M/s. M. Khan Mohamed, Room No. 10, 1st Floor, 40, Khandla Street, Jivaji Boari Chawl, Two Tanks, Bombay-400038.
15. M/s. Vinsons, Imperial Chambers, Vilson Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay-400038.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the employers at S. No. 1 to 14—Shri K. M. Jamadar, Advocate.

For the Workmen—(1) Shri S. R. Wagh, Advocate.
(2) Shri S. K. Shetye, General Secretary, Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union, Bombay.

STATE : Maharashtra INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks.

Bombay, the 26th August, 1977

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour acting under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication by its order No. L-51011/9/74-PD/CMT dated 26-12-1974.

"Whether the following demands made by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, P. D'Mello Bhavan, P. D'Mello Road, Carnac Bunder, Bombay-400 038, against the employers mentioned in the Schedule I above are justified; and if so, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?

1. (a) The watchmen should be paid Wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wages Board for Port and Dock Workers.
- (b) Headwatchmen and gangway watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 more than the watchmen per shift as wages.
- (c) At least one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, in a transit shed and in a godown.
2. (a) All watchmen and Headwatchmen should be given holidays with pay on all holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust as holidays for Dock Workers.
- (b) All watchmen and Headwatchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rate of wages.
3. All watchmen and headwatchmen should be given one month's leave with pay per calendar year.
4. All Watchmen and Headwatchmen should be given 4 sets of uniforms and a pair of shoes per year.
5. All employees should be paid an amount equal to the bus or railway fare for travel between Bombay and native place of the worker and back in a year."

In pursuance of this reference the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay have filed a statement of claim stating that the workmen herein who are watchmen are Dock Workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948. They contend that the watchmen engaged by the 15 Contractors (hereinafter referred to as companies), who are parties to this reference are required to perform the duties in connection with storage of cargo at places or premises in the Docks of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay. They are sent to work at ships, barges, country crafts, wharfs, bunders, transit sheds and Warehouses and other places in or in the vicinity of the Port and Docks at Bombay for Watch and Ward of the Import and Export Cargo. They contend that since the Watchmen herein are Dock Workers within the meaning of Act 9 of 1948 they should be paid wages and other allowances on a par with the other Dock Workers, at the rates recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. At present the Watchmen are being paid at the rate of Rs. 6 and the Head Watchmen at the rate of Rs. 7 per head per shift. They are not paid

any Dearness Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance, House Rent Allowance or any other allowance admissible to other Dock Workers with whom they work side by side. They claim wages and other allowances with retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board as accepted by the Central Government by its resolution dated 28-3-1970. They submit that they should be paid wages on monthly scales on the basis of 30 days per month with a further direction that these workmen be treated as permanent employees of the companies. They want that the Head Watchmen and Gangway Watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 per head per shift more than the ordinary watchmen as they have to discharge more onerous and responsible duties. They urge that one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, transit shed and godown. At present the watchmen are not being given any paid holidays. They demand that all the holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust should be treated as holidays for them also. They further submit that at present they are not being paid any extra remuneration when they work on holidays. They claim wages at double the normal rates when they are made to work on holidays. At present the Watchmen are not being given any earned leave. They pray that earned leave for 30 days in a year may be given. They say that two sets of uniform per year that are now being supplied to them are not sufficient and that this number be raised to 4 sets, having regard to the fact that they work in sun and rain and come into contact with chemicals and explosives. They also say that the Watchmen should be supplied with one pair of shoes per year to look smarter in their uniform and also by way of protection for their feet. Along with the uniform they pray for payment of adequate monthly washing allowance. Lastly they say that leave travel concession at the end of every year should be given to them to enable them to see their folk in their far off villages.

The Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union filed a separate statement of claim on behalf of Watchmen working under the companies who are parties 1, 13 & 15 to this reference on the same lines as that filed by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union.

The Watchmen Contractors who are parties 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 to his reference and 3 other contractors have formed themselves on 9-8-1974 into an Association known as "Ship-Watchmen Contractors' Association". On their behalf the President of the Association filed a common statement dated 28-1-1975 contending that the Watchmen in question are not Dock Workers within the meaning of Act 9 of 1948 and therefore not entitled to the benefits the other Dock Workers are entitled to under the Central Wage Board's recommendations. They further submit that the contractors cannot afford to bear the extra financial burden involved in the claim made by the workmen. They say that for every four or more watchmen posted on Board the ship one Headwatchman is engaged. According to them they are paying the extra remuneration of Re. 1 to the Head Watchmen without obtaining any reimbursement from their principals. They submit that no Headwatchman is required to be employed if the number of watchmen posted on a ship is less than 4. They say that their financial position does not permit them to give earned leave and holidays to the Watchmen or pay them double the normal wages in case they are made to work on holidays. They further submit that the Watchmen are employed purely on a temporary basis. They are not permanent workers. Since their working days do not exceed 240 days in a year they cannot be given one month's leave with pay per year. They say that two sets of uniform that are now being supplied every year are sufficient. They submit that the demand for 4 sets of uniform and a pair of shoes is not justified.

On behalf of the Association a supplementary written statement was filed on 3-1-1976. In the supplementary statement the points raised in the earlier statement are only elaborated.

Party No. 15 M/s. Vinsons has filed a separate statement questioning the legality and maintainability of this reference. They also question the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to entertain this reference. Their stand is that since they do not employ any Watchmen on ships they cannot be considered to be necessary and proper party to this reference. They pray that their name may be deleted from this reference.

On the above averments the points that arise for consideration are :—

1. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948 and if so whether they are entitled to the wages recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
2. If not whether this reference is liable to be rejected ?
3. Whether the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are entitled to be paid salary on a monthly basis together with Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
4. Whether the Head-watchmen and the Gangway Watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 per shift more than the other Watchmen ?
5. Whether there should be a Head-watchman on every ship, in a Transit Shed or in a Godown ?
6. Whether all Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared as holidays by the Bombay Port Trust for Dock Workers ?
7. Whether all Watchmen and Head-watchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rates of wages ?
8. Whether all the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given one month's leave with pay in a calendar year ?
9. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given four sets of uniform and one pair of shoes per year together with washing allowance ?
10. Whether all the Watchmen and Head-watchmen in question are entitled to annual leave travel concession ?
11. Whether the benefits if any of this adjudication should be given retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 or from the date of reference or any other date in between ?
12. To what relief ?

Point 1 :

The workmen involved in this dispute are Watchmen engaged by the Watchmen-contractors of Shipping Companies or their Agents. The Watchmen Contractors receive some remuneration for every Watchmen they engage for their principals. From out of it, by the date of this reference, they were paying Rs. 6 per head to each Watchman and Rs. 7 per head to each Head-watchmen per shift. The balance they kept towards their remuneration. In this case the principals of these Contractors are not examined to prove the exact remuneration they are paying to their Watchmen Contractors for every Watchman and Head Watchmen engaged on their behalf. Upto June 1970 the Watchmen were being paid Rs. 2 per head per shift. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union raised an industrial dispute with the employers for an upward revision of the wages of Watchmen and Head-watchmen vide Ex. E-4, Charter of demands dated 25-6-70. As per the settlement Ex. E-5 entered into between the parties before the Conciliation Officer on 30-7-1970 the remuneration of Watchman was raised from Rs. 2 to Rs. 6 and that of Head-watchmen to Rs. 7 per head per shift. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union issued the notice Ex. E-6 dated 2-3-1974 terminating that settlement Ex. E-3, a fresh charter of demands was served on the companies giving rise to the present reference. The basis of the claim of the workmen as set out in the written statements of claim is that they are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948 and therefore covered by the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers as accepted by the Central Government. The companies contend that the Watchmen do not come within that definition of Dock Workers. Therefore the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers' cannot be extended to them.

In this connection it is necessary to set out Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948 :—

"2(b)—'dock worker' means a person employed or to be employed in, or in the vicinity of, any port or work in connection with the loading, unloading, movement or storage of cargoes, or work in connection with the preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt of discharge of cargoes of leaving port;"

It is to be seen whether the work of the Watchmen in question comes within the scope of the above definition. It is not in dispute that they are employed in the port or in its vicinity. The question in controversy is whether they are engaged in work in connection with loading, unloading, movement, storage of cargo or work in connection with preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port. On this point there is the evidence of five witnesses for the employers and 3 witnesses for the employees.

EW-2 Shri K. A. Shaikh, Assistant Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union is practically a witness for the workmen. Shri Khimji Ranchodji, EW-3, Shri M. B. Nazereth EW-4 and Shri M. Moin Khan EW-5 speak on this question in support of the Employers' case.

EW-3 (Party No. 11) is the General Secretary of the Employers' Association consisting of parties 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 and M/s. Indian Surveyors Pvt. Ltd. which is a party to reference No. CGIT-2/4 of 1975 which is being disposed of along with this reference. He has given evidence not only for himself but on behalf of the other members of his Association. His is the case of an ordinary Watchman rising to the position of a Watchmen contractor. Having been a Watchman himself and now a Watchman Contractor his evidence on the points in dispute is entitled to great weight. According to him the Watchmen are engaged on board the ship and not at the Godowns. They are not posted to guard the cargo in the shed or in the Godown. Their sole duty is said to be to keep a watch over the cargo. They are engaged on board the ship to keep a watch over the ship including all fittings like gear, wire-rope and cabins of the ship's officers. When the Stevedoring Gang board the vessel or dis-embark from the vessel they are searched and checked by the Watchmen. The Captain of the Ship orders the Watchmen to go to the Hatch to see that the cases of cargo are not broken open by the Stevedoring workmen. The Watchmen have nothing to do with the work of loading and unloading cargo. In his cross-examination he states that the Watchmen engaged by the Port Trust do not watch the private property of the Exporters and Importers lying in the docks. He denies the suggestion that such property of private parties lying inside the Dock is watched by the Watchmen engaged by the Contractors. He further denies the suggestion that the Cargo of the principals if temporarily unloaded at Bombay Port should be watched by the Watchmen in question. He added that he never asked his watchmen to look after cargo temporarily unloaded by his principals but some other contractors who are also parties to this reference may take up such responsibility by engaging watchmen for that purpose. He further stated that one or two contractors who are parties to this dispute, might engage Watchmen to keep a watch over the Cargo lying in the Docks but he had never done so. He denies the suggestion that the contractors including himself engage watchmen on barges, when the ships unload their cargo thereon. He further stated that no contractor engages watchmen on country crafts, wharves, Bunders, Transit Sheds. There might be one or two exceptions to this usual practice. He admits that he engages watchmen to take care of the property lying outside the ship but inside the Dock.

EW-4, Shri M. B. Nazereth, (Party No. 3) aged about 26 years says that he has been doing this Contractors business since 1970. Besides this Contract business he is engaged in working as an Insurance Agent and teaching "effective public speaking" at the Indo-American Society. He engages watchmen only on board the ship and not outside the ship. The Watchmen are engaged to keep a watch over the ship and its cargo while inside the ship. They are not engaged in the work of loading or unloading the cargo. A very significant statement made by this witness is that the

watchmen are 'supposed' to keep a watch on the cargo during the loading and unloading operation. They are not concerned with the movement of Cargo nor with the preparation of ships for sailing. In his cross-examination he was asked what he meant by saying that the watchmen are not concerned with the movement of cargo. He replied saying that because the watchmen do not physically handle the cargo he would say they were not engaged in the movement of cargo. He does not know what is meant by preparation of ship for sailing.

EW-5 Shri Moin Khan is party No. 14 to this dispute. He does not throw any light on the nature of work done by a Watchman.

EW-2 Shri Shaikh is the Assistant Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union for the past 16 years. In his cross-examination he stated that the watchmen work in the vicinity of the Docks and Port in Bombay for watch and ward purpose, for the purpose of Import and Export of Cargo. According to him the Watchmen are Dock Workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948. This witness was examined on behalf of the employers to prove the settlement of the earlier dispute, that arose in 1970 June between the workmen and the companies herein. The workmen taking advantage of the presence of this witness in the box elicited certain information favourable to them. The learned Counsel for the employers during the course of the re-examination of this witness, did not challenge the correctness of the statements made by him during his cross-examination.

WW-1 Shri Dastagir Abdul Maji is the watchman engaged by party No. 2 to this reference M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons, Bombay. He has been in their service for the past 16 years. He says that he works in the Docks, Ships, Sheds, Hay Bunder, Butcher Island and Launches. He says that he also works outside the Warehouses. He keeps a watch over the general cargo. He has to make a search of the crew members at the Gang-way. No cross-examination is directed on this part of his evidence relating to the duties of the watchmen. In his cross-examination the witness stated that at times Supervisors of the Agent of the Vessel give instructions to place watchmen on duty in the shed also.

WW-2. Mohamed Naimkhan Salam Mohamed Sherif Khan has been working as Watchmen for the past 10 years under M/s. Subratikhan & Sons, party No. 13. He says that there are 65 Watchmen in that company along with him. They work on ships, barges, country crafts, Bunder, Butcher Island, Transit sheds, warehouses inside the docks. They are also required to keep a watch on import and export cargo. They are required to work on sheds, in the gangways and also at hatches. In his cross-examination he stated that he watches the cargo both on the Steamer as well as inside the Godown.

WW-3 Shri Kalekhan claims to be Head-Watchman working with M/s. Vinsons Party No. 15. In his cross-examination he stated that when the ship is in the harbour he works on the ship and when the ship leaves the harbour he works in the godown. He also keeps a watch over the cargo lying in the docks.

On the above evidence it has to be seen if the Watchmen in question are employed in or in the vicinity of the port, in connection with the loading, unloading, movement or storage of cargoes, or work in connection with the preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port. The evidence of EWs. 3 and 4 clearly shows that the Watchmen are engaged to keep a watch over the cargo while it is being loaded or unloaded. The statement of FW-2 Shri Shaikh and that of WWs. 1 and 2 to this effect has not been seriously questioned. From the evidence of EW-3, the Secretary of the Employers' Association it appears that the workmen are also engaged to keep a watch over the cargo while it is lying in the dock. The Watchmen may not be actually handling the cargo themselves but their work is certainly connected with the loading and unloading operations of cargo because they have to keep a watch over those operations to prevent pilferage of the cargo. Relying on the above evidence I find that the watchmen are dock workers with the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948.

Even so Shri Jamadar for the companies submits that the workmen are not entitled to the pay scales recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. He invites attention to para. 6.24 of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers wherein it is stated that the Watchmen along with certain other categories are not covered by the recommendations made by them. The reason for excluding the five categories mentioned in that para. including the watchmen from the report was because of the objection raised by the employers and not because the members of the Board had any doubt on the question whether the Watchmen were Dock Workers within the meaning of Act, 9 of 1948, or no. Reference may be had to para 7.2.94 (ibid) under the heading "Miscellaneous categories of dock workers" in which the Watchmen are included. At page 217 of that report, they recommended wage scales for the watchmen engaged by M/s. Union Lighterage Company, Dharsi Moolji & Company, Bombay with a note "not dock workers, according to employer members". For the miscellaneous category of Dock workers wage scales are recommended on the same page and this includes the scales of pay for Watchmen and Head Watchmen. Even if the watchmen and Head Watchmen are excluded from the recommendations of the Wage Board on account of the objection raised by the employers still there is no reason why the benefit of the scales of pay recommended by the Wage Board after such extensive and deep study of the problems of the Dock Workers should not be extended to them.

Shri Jamadar further contends that the workmen must be deemed to have waived their right to claim the benefits of the recommendations of the Wage Board for the reason that they did not claim them at the appropriate time, viz., at the time of the earlier dispute in June, 1970. At page 226 of the Report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers the names of the members constituting the said Board are given. Shri S. R. Kulkarni was one of the members representing the workers. From EW-2, Shri Shaikh's evidence we get that Shri Kulkarni was the Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union and also the President of All India Port and Dock Workers' Federation. It is argued that since Shri Kulkarni representing the Dock workers did not press the claim of the Watchmen before the Wage Board no relief can be given by this Tribunal to these Watchmen on the basis of that report. The further argument advanced on behalf of the companies is that by 1970, June, on behalf of the Watchmen, the Transport and Dock Workers Union submitted a charter of demands Ex. E-4 and the dispute was settled between the parties amicably as per the settlement dated 30-7-1970 raising the wages of the Watchmen from Rs. 2 to Rs. 6 and that of the Head Watchman to Rs. 7 per shift. By the date of that settlement the report of the Central Wage Board was published in the Gazette and should have been within the knowledge of the Union. Further the Wage Board recommended interim relief on 9-4-1965, which was accepted by the Central Government on 25-4-1965 and published in the Gazette of India, Part I, Sec. I on 15-5-1965. The Second interim relief recommended by the Wage Board was accepted by the Central Government vide Gazette of India, Part I, Section I dated 29th October, 1966 at page 714. It is argued that in spite of the fact that the Union was aware of the recommendations of the Wage Board by 30-7-1970 in regard to the watchmen still they did not press for payment of wages as per those recommendations. This conduct on the part of the Union is said to amount to waiver of the right available to the workmen under that report. I do not agree with this reasoning. It is submitted by Shri Wagh for the Union that in the year 1970 the Watchmen and the Head Watchmen were not members of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union. Therefore their claims could not have been effectively pressed before the Wage Board. It is further submitted that by the time the Wage Board was constituted the watchmen of M/s. Union Lighterage Company alone were members of their Union and their claims were pressed before the Board. The Wage Board also determined the Wage scales properly payable to these persons. He submitted that it is not correct to say that the workmen's representative abandoned the case of the Watchmen altogether. Regarding the other contention that the workmen should be deemed to have waived their right under the Wage Board's report on account of their conduct in June, 1970, Shri Wagh says that at that time the Watchmen's scale of pay were so low, that they had to take some quick action to obtain immediate relief. For that reason they did not press the benefit available to the watchmen under the Wage Board's recommendations. Even if the Union had by their inadvertence failed

to claim the benefits due to the watchmen under the Wage Board's recommendations in the year 1970, still they cannot be now denied that benefit on that account. This plea of estoppel is certainly not available to the management in an industrial dispute.

For the aforesaid reasons point 1 is found against the employers and in favour of the workmen.

Point 2 :

In view of the finding recorded on point 1, this point has to be answered against the companies.

Point 3 :

Under point 1 it is found that the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Act, 9 of 1948 and though the Wage Board has specifically stated that their recommendations were not applicable to the Watchmen still the scales of pay recommended by the Wage Board for this category of workers should be usefully adopted. On behalf of the companies it is urged that these watchmen are casual workmen employed for about 5 to 7 days in a month. They say that there is no element of permanency in their service. During the period they are not on duty under the companies they are said to be free to work elsewhere, and therefore the question of payment of wages on monthly scale, holiday, earned leave and other benefits do not arise. The contention that the watchmen are only casual workers without any element of permanency is not supported by the evidence on record. WW-1, D. A. Majid stated that he has been working under party No. 2 to this dispute (M/s B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons) for the past 16 years. He says that he gets employment under that company for 25 days in a month. If he has to absent himself from duty he has to obtain the previous permission of his employer. In his cross-examination his statement that he has been working for the past 16 years continuously under M/s B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons has not been challenged. No witness on behalf of M/s B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons has been examined to challenge the correctness of the statement made by him. In his cross-examination he further stated that if he had to apply for sick leave he should produce a medical certificate.

WW-2, Mohamed Naimkhan Salam Mohamed Sherif Khan says that he has been working under M/s. Subratikhan & Sons party No. 13 to this dispute for the past 10 years. He says that for about 26 to 30 days in a month he gets employment under this company. Like WW-1 this witness also says that before going on leave he should submit an application for grant of leave in the prescribed form. In the case of this witness also his employer has not been examined to challenge the correctness of his statement. In his cross-examination the statement that he has been working for the past 10 years continuously for M/s Subratikhan & Sons is not questioned. It is not even suggested to him that he could absent himself from duty as and when he pleased without having got to apply for leave.

WW-3, Shri Kalekhan says that he has been working as a watchman for the past 25 years with M/s. Vinsons (Party No. 15). In the cross-examination of this witness his claim that he has been working for M/s Vinsons for the past 25 years has not been questioned though they say that this witness was never their employee but only their watchmen contractor.

EW-3 Shri Khimji Ranchodji, Secretary of the companies Association and also party to this dispute stated that no Watchman works for him for more than 4 years. According to him most of them do not care to work for more than one year. When he was asked as to why he was not giving earned leave, casual leave or sick leave to the watchmen he stated that he could not afford to give such facilities. It is not his case that because the watchmen were casual employees such benefits were not extended to them. He admits that he pays bonus to his Watchmen.

EW-4, Mr. M. B. Nazereth, stated that the 4 watchmen he is now employing have been with him in this business from the days of his grand-father. This will give an idea of the permanency of service of these watchmen.

EW-5, Moin Khan stated that his 3 Watchmen have been working with him since 1972,
89 G. of 1/77—10.

On the above evidence the case of the employers that the work of these watchmen is of a highly casual nature cannot be accepted. The 3 most prosperous employers according to EW-3 viz., M/s. Menlyn & Co., M/s. Subratikhan & Sons and M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons (Parties to this dispute) did not care to lead any evidence on their behalf.

Regarding the number of days each watchmen gets employment, there is the evidence of EWS-3 and 4 and that of the workmen WWs-1 and 2. EW-3 has stated that the Watchmen work in 3 shifts daily and that each watchman gets work for 25 shifts per month. The number of shifts each workmen works is indicated in the Muster-roll Ex. E-8 produced by him. The Muster-roll for January, 1974 shows that no watchmen of his had worked for more than one shift on any given day. It further shows that 5 out of the 16 watchmen get employment for 25 shifts at the rate of one shift per day for the month of January, 1974 and 8 Watchmen work for 20 shifts or more per month at the rate of one shift per day.

EW-4, Mr. M. B. Nazereth, stated that each Watchman gets work for 25 to 30 shifts in a month. He has not produced his Attendance Register to show if the number of shifts is calculated at the rate of one shift per day or otherwise.

On the side of the workmen WWs. 1 and 2 have stated that they get employment for 25 to 30 days in month and there is no cross-examination of these witnesses on that point. As already stated the most prosperous 3 concerns in this line of business have not chosen to lead any evidence on this point.

On the above evidence it has to be held that the Watchmen get employment for 25 to 30 days in a month on an average every month. This also indicates that the work of the Watchman is not of a casual nature as contended by the companies.

It is to be next considered under this issue to what pay, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance are the workmen entitled? As already stated the scales of pay recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers for Watchmen and Head-watchmen can be usefully adopted and on that basis the Watchmen be paid salaries on a monthly basis instead of at a daily rate. The Central Wage Board at page 217 of its report recommended a scale of Rs. 100-2-130 for the Watchmen and at page 218 the scale of Rs. 115-3-136-4-160 in the case of Head-watchmen (for Head-watchmen in Bombay). On this salary they should get Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance, at the rates recommended by the said Wage Board. Shri Wagh and Shri Shetye for the workmen urged that if the scales recommended by the Central Wage Board in its report of the year 1969 are to be accepted and given effect to in this award retrospective effect should be given to this award from 1-1-1969 or at least from the date of this reference viz. 26-12-1974. Shri Jamadar for the Companies requests that retrospective effect may not be given to this Award for the reason that it will be very difficult for the companies to claim reimbursement from their principals for the excess amount payable. It is then argued on behalf of the workmen that the pay of the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen may be fixed as per the recommendations of the Wage Board of the year 1969 as modified by the Wage Revision Committee. The stand taken by the Unions on behalf of the workmen appears to be reasonable. I therefore hold that the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen should be given wages in the scale of Rs. 100-2-130 and the Rs. 115-3-136-4-160 per month respectively besides other allowances as recommended by the Central Wage Board and as subsequently modified by the Wage Revision Committee.

Shri Jamadar for the employers submits that the companies will not be in a position to bear this extra financial burden. It is argued on behalf of the workmen that the companies herein are mere contractors and they do not pay the wages of these Watchmen from out of their pocket. They collect some amount per each Watchman and Head-watchmen from the Shipping Companies or their agents and pay something less than the amount collected to the workmen keeping the balance towards their commission. When each Watchman was paid Rs. 2 till June, 1970 according to EW-3 the principals were paying a sum of Rs. 3 per Watchman. When in terms of the Settlement Ex. E-5 dated 30-7-1970 the wages of Watchmen were enhanced to Rs. 6 and that of the Head-Watchmen to Rs. 7, EW-3 says that the companies began to

collect Rs. 10 per Watchman and Head-Watchman retaining the balance towards their commission. It is argued for the workman that if this Tribunal further enhances the wage scale of these workmen shipping companies or their agents who are quite capable of bearing the extra burden will certainly raise the amount they are paying to the companies herein. There is considerable force in this argument advanced on behalf of the workmen. It may also be seen that the 3 or 5 of the most prosperous companies in this line of business who are parties to this dispute did not care to lead evidence in support of their plea that they cannot bear the extra financial burden. From this attitude of theirs also, it may be inferred that they have the necessary capacity to pay the enhanced wages. The smallest of the companies like those of EWs, 3 to 5 have come forward to plead their inability. If the smaller contractors are unable to bear the extra burden they may have to close down their business. The Wage scales that are recommended for the Watchmen and the Head Watchmen by the Central Wage Board are the minimum wages, which any employer has to pay. As submitted by Shri Wagh the Shipping Companies and their Agents will certainly raise this amount payable for these watchmen to enable the companies to bear the extra financial burden and at the same time help them keep a margin for themselves. No witness from the Shipping Companies or their Agents has been examined to say that if the remuneration of the Watchmen and Head Watchmen is to be raised they will not pay the extra amount to their contractors. The apprehension of the witnesses EWs, 3 to 5 that in the event of the wage scales of the workmen in question are to be raised they may have to wind up their business appears to be more imaginary than real. The above scales of pay fixed for Watchmen and Head-watchmen do not include Stream allowance and such other allowances as are usually paid besides their regular wages.

Point 3 answered accordingly for the workmen.

Point 4 :

Admittedly the Head Watchman receives Re. 1 more than the ordinary Watchman. In the statement of claim the Head-Watchman claims Rs. 2 per head per shift instead of the existing rate of Re. 1. As higher scale of pay is fixed for the Head-watchman this question of payment of extra remuneration to him for every shift does not arise.

Point 4 answered accordingly

Point 5 :

In their statement of claim it is stated that at least one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, in transit shed and in Godown. They say that not all the companies are engaging Head Watchmen. They say that they have raised this demand to regularise the practice of engaging Head-watchmen and compel the employers who are not now engaging a Head-watchman to fall in line. The companies in their statement stated that this demand for engaging a Head-watchman on every ship cannot be acceded to since their employment is not in their hands but in the hands of the principals.

EW-3, Shri Khimji Ranchodji has stated that for every 4 Watchmen engaged on a ship there will be one Head-watchman. He further stated that the maximum number of watchmen that may be engaged on a ship is 3 and the minimum is one. EW-4 does not speak about this aspect of the case nor EW-5. On behalf of the workmen WWs, 1 and 2 did not speak to the practice that is now prevailing regarding the engagement of Headwatchmen. In the circumstances the evidence of EW-3 has to be accepted. On the basis of that I hold that for every 4 Watchmen one Head Watchmen should be engaged.

Point 5 found accordingly

Point 6 :

In the statement of claim of the workmen it is stated that all the watchmen and the Head-watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared by the Bombay Port Trust as holidays for Dock workers. They say that at present the Watchmen and the Head-Watchmen are not entitled

to claim wages for these holidays while all other dock workers enjoy this facility. The companies in their written statement say that since the employment of the watchmen is of a casual nature the grant of paid holidays to them does not arise. During the discussion on point 3 it is held that the Watchmen are not engaged on casual basis, but on a fairly permanent basis. So this contention of the companies in their written statement that the employment of Watchmen is essentially of a casual nature and therefore the question of grant of paid holidays to them does not arise cannot be accepted. In the course of his evidence EW3 the Secretary of the Companies Association has stated that the companies do not give their watchmen the facilities of earned leave, sick leave or casual leave because they cannot afford to do so. The other employers' witness have not adverted to this matter in the course of their evidence. On behalf of the workers it is argued that justice requires that the Watchmen should be given paid holidays on the same footing as other persons working in the Docks. They say that the conditions of service of all the Dock Workers working side by side should be the same. It is represented that at present in every year 13 holidays besides Sundays are declared by the Bombay Port Trust for their employees. I see no reason why the same benefit of paid holidays should not be extended to the workmen in question also.

Point 6 accordingly answered for the workmen.

Point 7 :

The Unions on behalf of the Watchmen say that if any Watchman is employed on any holiday he should be paid double the normal wages. The ships that come to the harbour for loading or unloading operations have to be attended to without any delay. It follows that men have to work on all days, whether they be working days or holidays. It is said that the Bombay Port Trust declares 13 days in a year as paid holidays for its workmen, besides all Sundays. The question is whether the Watchman should be paid double the normal wages on all the holidays, if there is work to do. So far as Sundays (i.e. weekly rest day) are concerned it is but fair that the Watchmen should be paid double the wages, if they have to forego their weekly rest day. Similarly the first of May which is said to be one of the 13 days declared as holidays for the Dock workers, the workmen herein would like to participate in the workers' Rallies, conducted by the Trade Unions. If the Watchmen are called upon to work on that day they should be paid double the normal wages. The same thing holds good with regard to the Independence day and Republic day (15-8 and 26-1 of every year respectively). It has to be seen if the Watchmen should be paid double the wages on the other dock holidays, if they are called upon to work on those days. For instance, it is not necessary that a Hindu or a Muslim should observe Christmas or that a Christian or a Muslim should observe Dassera or Dipawali. I feel that only when a Watchman is asked to work on a holiday, which happens to be a day of festival or has some significance according to his religious persuasion should he be entitled to payment of double the normal wages.

I therefore find on point 7 that work if taken on Sundays, Independence day, Republic Day and May day (i.e. First of May) should be paid at double the normal rate of wages. If work is taken on days which are declared as festival holidays wages should be paid at double the normal wages on a Sectional basis.

Point 8 :

The workmen demand one month's earned leave for every year of service. The companies say that they cannot afford to meet this commitment. Till now the Watchmen are not being given any leave whatsoever, not even casual leave or sick leave. The demand for grant of earned leave appears to be justified. The workers have not asked for casual leave or sick leave separately. Shri Jamadar for the companies submits that out of this 30 days earned leave asked for, a portion of it may be given as casual leave, another portion as sick leave and the balance as earned leave. I feel that casual leave of 5 days, and sick leave of 4 days in a year may be granted. So far as sick leave is concerned it can be accumulated indefinitely. The casual leave if not availed of in a year, will lapse at the conclusion of that

year. The balance of 21 days may be called earned leave. It can be accumulated upto 3 years.

Point 8 found accordingly.

Point 9 :

At present the Watchmen are being supplied 2 sets of uniform consisting of a pair of trousers and a bush shirt with half-sleeves. No foot-wear is supplied along with the uniform. While the Watchmen say that 2 sets of uniform will not last through the year, the employers say that they are quite sufficient. The Watchmen say that a pair of leather shoes should be supplied to them every year to add to their smartness and also give protection to their feet as they have to watch loading and unloading of chemicals and explosives. I feel that a pair of leather shoes should form part of the uniform and it should be supplied by the employers. I further hold that 2 pairs of uniform per year should suffice, if they are carefully worn only while on duty.

The Watchmen claim washing allowance for their uniforms. On behalf of the companies it is argued that since this washing allowance does not find a place in the Charter of demands Ex. E-7 the workmen are not entitled to this relief. This claim also does not form part of the points of dispute referred to this Tribunal, under the reference in question. It is sought to be argued on behalf of the workmen that washing allowance comes under the head of provision of uniform and therefore it is open to this Tribunal to consider that question also. I do not agree.

On point 9 I find that there is no need to supply more than 2 sets of uniform per year. I further find that along with the uniform a pair of leather shoes should be supplied to the Watchmen, every year. The claim for washing allowance is rejected.

Point 10 :

On behalf of the Watchmen it is said that the Watchmen come from different regions of the country and unless the employers help them they cannot afford to go periodically to their villages to see their kith and kin or to keep themselves in touch with the village. It is said that a change of environment once a year, will refresh a workman and also improve his general standard of health. It is also said that since leave travel concession is not asked for, for their entire family but only for the individual workman, the demand may be considered favourably. On behalf of the employers it is submitted that they cannot afford to pay for this amenity. I feel that leave Travel Concession to each individual employee (and not for his entire family) may be granted once in three years.

Point 10 found accordingly.

Point 11 :

This aspect of the case is already dealt with under point 3. As the companies express their inability to pay the revised rates of wages with retrospective effect, this prayer of the Watchmen is not granted. To compensate the workmen for the loss suffered by them on this account, they are being given wages at a scale higher than they have actually claimed. In the statement of claim, the Watchmen prayed for grant of wages at the rates recommended by the Central Wage Board in its report of the year 1969. After the date of reference, the recommendations of the Wage Revision Committee have been accepted by the Central Government as a result of which higher scales of pay are being paid to the dock workers. Shri Shetye and Shri Wagh have urged that the benefit of the higher wage scale may be given to the workmen herein. I agree. The benefit of this award should be given from 15-8-1977.

Point 11 found accordingly.

Before concluding one more matter remains to be considered. Party No. 15 (M/s. Vinsons) filed a written statement stating that they do not employ any Watchmen on ships and therefore are improperly impleaded as a party to this reference. Shri Shetye for the workmen disputes the truth of this contention. Kalekhan (WW-3) says that he has been working as a Watchmen and Head Watchmen

under M/s. Vinsons for the past 25 years. In support of that he has filed 2 brass buckles issued by M/s. Vinsons (Ex. W-18 and W-19), bearing the following legend :

“VINSONS

Ex. W-18.

Stevedores Dubashes & Contractors Clearing
Shipping & Travel Agents
WATCHMAN No. 150”

“VINSONS

Ex. W-19.

Stevedores Dubashes & Contractors
Clearing Shipping & Travel Agents
KALEKHAN HEAD WATCHMAN

No. 1”

EW-1 Shri Vazirani, one of the partners of M/s. Vinsons admits having issued the buckle Ex. W-18 bearing No. 150 and not the other Ex. W-19. The buckle Ex. W-18 probalises the contention of WW-3. I believe WW-3 when he says that the buckle W-19 was also issued by M/s. Vinsons. In the certificates issued by M/s. Vinsons Ex's W-2 to W-4, WW-3 is described as their Watchman. Ex's W-14 to W-16 are letters addressed by M/s. Vinsons to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station requesting him to issue temporary passes to their Watchman. On behalf of M/s. Vinsons Ex. E-9 consisting of 11 receipts passed in their favour is filed for the purpose of showing that they were not engaging any Watchmen. These receipts significantly come into existence after this dispute is referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Exhibits E-9(1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7) and (10) are the receipts passed by WW-3 in favour of M/s. Vinsons. The receipts show the amount received by WW-3 for the Watchmen engaged. In each of these the number of Watchmen and Head Watchmen engaged is given. On the basis of these receipts it is sought to be argued that WW-3 is a Watchmen Contractor of M/s. Vinsons. Admittedly (EW-1 admits) M/s. Vinsons are Watchmen Contractors. Why they should engage another such contractor is not clear. Again the receipts Ex. E-9 series show the payment of Rs. 7/- per shift to Head Watchmen and Rs. 6/- per shift to the ordinary Watchmen, which are the actual prevailing rates of wages for this category of workmen by the respective dates on which the above receipts were passed. If WW-3 was a Contractor, in his own right one would expect him to collect something over and above the actual wages towards his commission. EW-1 or his representative does not say anything on this aspect. Further admittedly the entire amount on account of Watchmen is collected by M/s. Vinsons from their principals and only the actual wages are paid to this Watchman. The balance is obviously being retained by M/s. Vinsons.

For the aforesaid reasons I hold that M/s. Vinsons are Watchmen Contractors and WW-3 is the 'Head Watchman' in their employ.

Point 12 :

In the result the points referred to this Tribunal for adjudication are answered as below :—

- 1(a) The Watchmen and the Head Watchmen should be paid wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers vide page 217 and 218 of the Report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers) as liberalised by the Wage Revision Committee. In the case of persons who are already in service, they should be given weightage at the rate of one increment for every five years of completed service. This is without prejudice to the claim of stream allowance and such other allowances, the Watchmen are entitled to at present, besides pay.

- (b) Since the Head Watchmen are being given a higher scale of pay, the question of payment of Rs. 2/- more per shift to them does not arise.
- (c) For every 4 Watchmen, one Head Watchman should be employed on every ship, transit shed and in a godown.
- 2(a) All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared as holiday by the Bombay Port Trust for the Dock Workers.
- (b) The Watchmen and Head Watchmen employed on all Sundays, on Independence Day, Republic day and May day should be paid double the normal rates of wages. In the case of other days declared as holidays on the basis of religion, according to the religious persuasion of each Watchman or Head Watchman double the normal wages should be paid, if they are called upon to work on those days.
3. All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given 5 days casual leave during every calendar year on full pay which cannot be accumulated.
4 days on full pay in a year as sick leave which can be accumulated indefinitely.
21 days of earned leave which can be accumulated upto three years.
4. All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given every year 2 sets of uniform consisting of one pair of trousers and one half-sleeved bush shirt and one pair of leather shoes.
5. All the Watchmen and Head Watchmen (and not their families) should be paid once in every 3 years an amount equal to the bus or II class Railway fare for travel between Bombay and their respective native places and back.

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE IN REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/2 of 1975

ORAL EVIDENCE

Witnesses examined

For the Employers :

1. EW-1 Shri Vishamdas Vazirani.
2. EW-2 Shri K. A. Sheikh.
3. EW-3 Shri Khimji Ranchodji.
4. EW-4 Shri M. B. Nazereth.
5. EW-5 Shri M. Moidin Khan.

For the Workmen :

1. WW-1 Shri Dastagir Abdul Majid.
2. WW-2 Shri Mohamed Naimkhan Salam Mohamed Sherif Khan.
3. WW-3 Shri Kalekhan.

DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR THE EMPLOYERS

S. Exhibit Description of documents

No. No.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----|-----|---|
| 1. | E-1 | Letter dated 4-2-1977 from M/s. Vinsons to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay. |
| 2. | E-2 | Letter dated January, 1977 from the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay to the Manager, India Steam Ships Company Ltd., Bombay. |
| 3. | E-3 | Letter dated 8-2-1977 from M/s. Vinsons to Shri Kalekhan Gundekhan. |
| 4. | E-4 | Charter of demand of Watchmen from dated 25-6-1970 from the Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Bombay to Shri Khimji Ranchodji, Bombay. |

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------------------------------|------|---|
| 5. | E-5 | Memorandum of Settlement dated 30-7-1970 entered into between the Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Bombay and 11 Employer companies. |
| 6. | E-6 | Notice of termination of agreement dated 2-3-1974 from the Transport & Dock, Workers' Union, Bombay to M/s. Khimji Ranchodji, Bombay. |
| 7. | E-7 | Charter of demands of Watchmen dated 3-5-1974 from the Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Bombay to M/s. Khimji Ranchodji, Bombay. |
| 8. | E-8 | Muster roll for the period Jan. 1974 to April, 1975. |
| 9. | E-9 | Letter dated 24-7-1975 from Shri Kale Khan, Head Watchman to M/s. Vinsons, Bombay, acknowledging receipt of amounts shown therein. There are 10 other receipts, signed by S/shri Kale Khan, Mohamed Ali, Gulam Mohamed and Abdul Satar. |
| 10. | E-10 | Letter dated 15-1-1968 from M/s. South India Corporation (Agencies) Private Ltd. to M/s. M. Moin Khan & Sons, Bombay. |
| 11. | E-11 | Letter dated 19-8-1970 from M/s. South India Corporation (Agencies) Private Ltd., to M/s. M. Moin Khan & Sons, Bombay-1. |
| 12. | E-12 | Receipt showing payment of bonus amount to S/shri Gulab Ibrahim, Hanif Mohamed and Mohan Shankar by M/s. M. Moin & Sons on 29-1-1972. |
| 13. | E-13 | Money receipts of M/s. M Moin Khan & Sons. |
| DOCUMENTS FOR THE WORKMEN | | |
| 1. | W-1 | Letter dated 28-1-1977 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting permission to enter the dock limits to Shri Kale Khan. |
| 2. | W-2 | Letter dated 29-6-1972 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay certifying that Shri Kale Khan Gundekhan is a temporary Watchman on a salary of Rs. 150/- per month. |
| 3. | W-3 | Certificate dated 29-6-1972 from M/s. Vinsons showing that Shri Kale Khan Gundekhan is a temporary Watchman on a salary of Rs. 200/- per month. |
| 4. | W-4 | Certificate dated 25-11-1972 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay showing that Shri Kale Khan is a temporary Watchman drawing a monthly salary of Rs. 150/-. |
| 5. | W-5 | Two books of M/s. Vinsons for the purpose of obtaining the certificate from the Chief Officer regarding the engagement of Watchmen on the ships. |
| 6. | W-6 | Letter dated 22-3-1975 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting to permit Shri Abrar Hussain, Watchman to enter the dock limits. |
| 7. | W-7 | Letter dated 18-8-1975 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting to permit Shri Gafoor, Watchman to enter the dock limits. |
| 8. | W-8 | Letter dated 9-2-1973 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting to permit Shri Akbar Hussein, Watchman to enter the Dock limits. |
| 9. | W-11 | Letter dated 20th January from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting to permit 3 Watchmen. |
| 10. | W-12 | Letter dated 15-12-1966 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate, Bombay requesting to permit three Watchmen. |
| 11. | W-13 | Letter dated 8-12-1966 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector, Yellow Gate Police Station Bombay requesting to permit four Watchmen. |
| 12. | W-14 | Letter dated 19-11-1966 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay. |
| 13. | W-15 | Letter dated 15-10-1966 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Police Inspector, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting to permit two Watchmen to enter in dock limits. |

- | | | |
|-----|------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 14. | W-16 | Letter dated 6-9-1966 from M/s. Vinsons, Bombay to the Police Inspector, Yellow Gate Police Station, Bombay requesting permit five Watchmen to enter in dock limits. |
| 15. | W-17 | Names of the employers and names and addresses of the Principals (To whom the Watchmen are supplied). |
| 16. | W-18 | Brass Badge issued to Shri Kale Khan as Watchman No. 150, by M/s. Vinsons, Bombay. |
| 17. | W-19 | Brass Badge issued to Shri Kale Khan as Head-watchman No. 1 by M/s. Vinsons, Bombay. |
| 18. | W-20 | Receipt dated 19-3-1977 showing payments to Watchmen. |

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-31011(9)/74-P&D/CMT/D.IV(A)]

S.O. 3256.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Indian Surveyors (Private) Limited, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd September, 1977.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/4 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Indian Surveyors (Private) Limited, 219, P.D'Mello Road, Bombay.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the employers.—Shri K. M. Jamadar, Advocate.

For the workmen.—Shri S. R. Wagh, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 26th August, 1977

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour acting under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, by its order No. L-31011/10/74-P&D/CMT/DIV(A) dated the 7th February, 1975:—

"Whether the following demands made by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, P. D'Mello Bhavan, P.D'Mello Road, Carnac Bunder, Bombay-400 038 against Messrs Indian Surveyors (Private) Limited, 219, P. D'Mello Road, Port, Bombay-400 038 are justified and if so, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?

- 1(a) The watchmen should be paid wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers.
- (b) Head Watchmen and gangway watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 more than the watchmen per shift as wages.
- (c) At least one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, Transit Shed and in a Godown.

- 2(a) All watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust as holidays for the dock workers.
- (b) All watchmen and Head Watchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rate of wages.
3. All watchmen and head watchmen should be given one month's leave with pay per calendar year.
4. All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given four sets of uniforms and one pair of shoes per year.
5. All employees should be paid an amount equal to the Bus or Railway fare for travel between Bombay and native place of the worker and back once in a year."

In pursuance of this reference the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay have filed a statement of claim stating that the workmen herein who are watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948. They contend that the watchmen engaged by the company are required to perform the duties in connection with storage of cargo at places or premises in the Docks of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay. They are sent to work on ships, barges, country crafts, wharfs, bunders, transit sheds and warehouses and other places in or in the vicinity of the Port and Dock at Bombay for Watch and Ward of the Import and Export Cargo. They contend that since the watchmen herein are Dock workers within the meaning of Act, 9 of 1948 they should be paid wages and other allowances on a par with the other Dock workers at the rates recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. At present the watchmen are being paid at the rate of Rs. 6 and the Head watchmen at the rate of Rs. 7 per head per shift. They are not paid any Dearness Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance, House Rent Allowance or any other allowance admissible to other Dock workers with whom they work side by side. They claim wages and other allowances with retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board as accepted by the Central Government by its Resolution dated 28-3-1970. They submit that they (watchmen) should be paid wages on monthly scales on the basis of 30 days per month with a further direction that these workmen be treated as permanent employees of the company. They want that the Headwatchmen and Gangway watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 per head per shift more than the ordinary watchmen as they have to discharge more onerous and responsible duties. They urge that one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, transit shed and godown. At present the watchmen are not being given any paid holidays. They demand that all the holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust should be treated as holidays for them also. They further submit that at present they are not being paid any extra remuneration when they work on holidays. They claim wages at double the normal rates when they are made to work on holidays. At present the watchmen are not being given any earned leave. They pray that earned leave for 30 days in a year may be given. They say that the two sets of uniform per year that are now being supplied to them are not sufficient and that this number be raised to 4 sets, having regard to the fact that they work in sun and rain and come into contact with chemicals and explosives. They also say that the Watchmen should be supplied one pair of shoes per year to look smarter in the uniform and also by way of protection for their feet. Along with the uniform they pray for payment of adequate monthly washing allowance. Lastly they say that leave travel concession at the end of every year should be given to them to enable them to see their folk in their far off villages.

The Watchmen Contractors who are parties 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 in Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975 and the Employer in this reference and other contractors have formed themselves on 9-8-1974 into an Association known as "Ship-Watchmen Contractors Association". On their behalf the President of the Association filed a common statement dated 28-1-1975 contending that the Watchmen in question are not Dock Workers within the meaning of the Act 9, of 1948 and

therefore not entitled to the benefits the other Dock workers are entitled to under the Central Wage Board's recommendations. They further submit that the contractors cannot afford to bear the extra financial burden involved in the claim made by the workmen. They say that for every four or more watchmen posted on Board the ship one Head-watchman is engaged. According to them they are paying an extra remuneration of Re. 1 to the Head watchman without obtaining any reimbursement from their principals. They submit that no Head watchman is required to be employed if the number of watchman posted on a ship is less than 4. They say that their financial position does not permit them to give earned leave and holidays to the watchmen or pay them double the normal wages in case they are made to work on holidays. They further submit that the watchmen are employed purely on a temporary basis. They are not permanent workers. Since their working days do not exceed 240 days in a year they cannot be given one month's leave with pay per year. They say that two sets of uniforms that are now being supplied every year are sufficient. They submit that the demand for 4 sets of uniform and a pair of shoes is not justified.

On behalf of the Association a supplementary written statement was filed on 3-1-1976. In the supplementary statement the points raised in the earlier statement are only elaborated.

On the above averments the points that arise for consideration are :—

1. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948 and if so whether they are entitled to the wages recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
2. If not whether this reference is liable to be rejected ?
3. Whether the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are entitled to be paid salary on a monthly basis together with Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
4. Whether the Head-watchmen and the Gangway Watchmen should be paid Rs. 2 per shift more than the other watchmen ?
5. Whether there should be a Head-watchmen on every ship, in a Transit shed or in a Godown ?
6. Whether all Watchmen and Head watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared as holidays by the Bombay Port Trust for Dock Workers ?
7. Whether all Watchmen and Head-watchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rates of wages ?
8. Whether all the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given one month's leave with pay in a calendar year ?
9. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given four sets of uniform and one pair of shoes per year and washing allowances.
10. Whether all the Watchmen and Head watchmen in question are entitled to annual leave travel concession ?
11. Whether the benefits if any of this adjudication should be given retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 or from the date of reference or any other date in between ?
12. To what relief ?

Since the points of dispute referred for adjudication and the pleadings of the parties in this case are identical with those in Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975, both the parties agreed to treat the evidence recorded in Reference

No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975 as evidence in this case. The learned Advocates appearing for the parties in this case have submitted that the arguments advanced in Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975 may be treated as arguments in this case also. In the circumstances, the reasoning adopted in the Award in Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975 may be adopted in this case also. For the reasons stated in that Award in Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975 copy of which is enclosed hereto the points arising for decision are answered as follows :—

Point 1 :

1. I find that the Watchmen and Head-watchmen herein are Dock Workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Regulation, Act 9 of 1948. I therefore hold that the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are entitled to wage scales as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers as modified by the Wage Revision Committee.

Point 2 :

2. In view the finding on point 1, this point has to be answered against the employers.

Point 3 :

I hold that the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen should be paid wages in the scale Rs. 100-2-130 and Rs. 115-3-136-4-160 per month respectively besides the other allowances like Dearness Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance and House Rent Allowance as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers as modified by the Wage Revision Committee.

Point 4 :

As higher scale of pay has been allowed for the Head Watchmen, payment of extra remuneration to them does not arise.

Point 5 :

I hold that for every four watchmen, one Headwatchman should be engaged.

Point 6 :

I hold that the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given holidays on all the days declared as such by the Bombay Port Trust for their employees.

Point 7 :

I hold that if the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are made to work on Sundays, Independence day, Republic Day and May Day they should be paid at double the normal rates of wages. I further hold that if work is taken from them on days which are declared as festival holidays the workmen herein should be paid at double the normal rates of wages according to the religious persuasion of each one of them on a Sectional basis.

Point 8 :

I hold that the workmen herein should be given in a calendar year 5 days casual leave, which cannot be accumulated, 4 days sick leave which can be accumulated indefinitely and 21 days earned leave which can be accumulated upto 3 years.

Point 9 :

There is no need to supply more than two sets of uniform to each workman. I further hold that along with the uniform a pair of leather shoes be supplied to each one of the workmen. They are not entitled to any washing allowance.

Point 10 :

I hold that Leave Travel Concession to each individual employee and not for the members of his family should be granted once in three years.

Point 11 :

I hold that no retrospective effect should be given to this Award. I further direct that the workmen herein should be given the benefit of this Award with effect from 15th August, 1977.

Point 12 :

In the result the points referred to this Tribunal for adjudication are answered as below : —

- 1 (a) The Watchmen and the Head-watchmen should be paid wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers (vide page 217 and 218 of the Report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers) as liberalised by the Wage Revision Committee. In the case of persons who are already in service, weightage should be given at the rate of one increment for every five years' of completed service. This is without prejudice to the claim of stream allowance and such other allowances, the watchmen are entitled to at present, besides pay.
- (b) Since the Head Watchmen are being given a higher scale of pay, the question of payment of Rs. 2/- more per shift to them does not arise.
- (c) For every four Watchmen, one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, transit shed and in a godown.
- 2 (a) All Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared as holiday by the Bombay Port Trust for the Dock Workers.
- (b) The Watchmen and Head Watchmen employed on all Sundays, on Independence Day, Republic day and May day should be paid double the normal rates of wages. In the case of other days declared as festival holidays on the basis of religion, according to the religious persuasion of each Watchman or Head-watchman double the normal wages should be paid, on a sectional basis, if they are called upon to work on those days.
3. All Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given five days casual leave during every calendar year on full pay which cannot be accumulated, four days on full pay in a year as sick leave which can be accumulated indefinitely and 21 days of earned leave which can be accumulated upto three years.
4. All Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given every year 2 sets of uniform consisting of one pair of trousers and one half-sleeved bush shirt and one pair of leather shoes.
5. All the Watchmen and Head-watchmen (and not their families) should be paid once in every 3 years an amount equal to the bus or Second Class Railway fare for travel between Bombay and their respective native places and back.

[No. L-31011(10)/74-P&D/CMT/D.IV(A)]

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2 BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employees in relation to the Watchmen Contractors

1. M/s. Menlyn & Co., Prestige Chambers, 4th Floor, Kalyan Street, Bombay-400 009.
2. M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons, Nanabhoy Mansion, 2nd Floor, Gunbow Street, Bombay 400001.

3. M/s. Nazareth Services, 47, Mint Road, Fort, Bombay-400001.

4. M/s. Ebrahim Taqi, 11, Dossa House, Gunbow Street, Bombay-400001.

5. M/s. Sunder Simon, New Dilkush Laundry, 28, Old Modi Street, Bombay-400001.

6. M/s. K. Roshan Khan & Sons, 15, Goa Street, Room No. 135, Bombay-400038.

7. M/s. A.S. Jagirdar, Usha Kiron Building, Ground Floor, Flat No. 3, 2nd Pasta Lane, Colaba, Bombay-400005.

8. M/s. Mohamad Hanif Sk. Abubakar, Geb. Mohd. Building, Hains Road, Byculla, Bombay-400011.

9. M/s. Safia Shaikh Abdul Latif, Shivaji Building, 3rd Floor, 50, Samuel Street, Bombay-400009.

10. M/s. M. Gani, New Dilkush Laundry, 28, Old Modi Street, Fort, Bombay-400001.

11. M/s. Khimji Ranchodji, 243, P. D'Mellow Road, Bombay-400038.

12. M/s. Madhu Verappa, 16, Kumpta Street, 4th Floor, Room No. 38, Fort, Bombay-400038.

13. M/s. Subratikhan & Sons, 21, Nariman Building, Room No. 10, Mangalore Street, Bombay-400038.

14. M/s. M. Khan Mohamad, Room No. 10, 1st Floor, 40, Khandla Street, Jivaji Boari Chawl, Two Tanks, Bombay-400038.

15. M/s. Vinsons, Imperial Chambers, Vilson Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay-400038.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers at S. No. 1 to 14.—Shri K. M. Jama-dar, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—1. Shri S. R. Wagh, Advocate. 2. Shri S. K. Shetye, General Secretary, Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union, Bombay.

STATE : Maharashtra

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

Bombay, dated the 26th August, 1977

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour acting under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, by its order No. L-51011/9/74-PD/CMT dated 26-12-1974.

"Whether the following demands made by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, P. D'Mello Bhavan, P.D'Mello Road, Carnac Bunder, Bombay-400038, against the employers mentioned in the Schedule I above are justified; and if so, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?

1. (a) The Watchmen should be paid wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers.
- (b) Head Watchmen and gangway watchmen should be paid Rs. 2/- more than the watchmen per shift as wages.
- (c) At least one Head Watchman should be employed on every ship, in a transit shed and in a godown.
- (a) All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust as holidays for Dock Workers.
- (b) All Watchmen and Head Watchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rate of wages.

3. All Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given one month's leave with pay per calendar year.
4. All Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given 4 sets of uniforms and a pair of shoes per year.
5. All employees should be paid an amount equal to the bus or railway fare for travel between Bombay and native place of the worker and back in a year."

In pursuance of this reference the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay have filed a statement of claim stating that the workmen herein who are watchmen are Dock Workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948. They contend that the watchmen engaged by the 15 Contractors (hereinafter referred to as companies), who are parties to this reference are required to perform the duties in connection with storage of cargo at places or premises in the Docks of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay. They are sent to work at ships, barges, country crafts, wharfs, bunders, transit sheds and Warehouses and other places in or in the vicinity of the Port and Docks at Bombay Watch and Ward of the Import and Export Cargo. They contend that since the Watchmen herein are Dock Workers within the meaning of Act 9 of 1948 they should be paid wages and other allowances on a par with the other Dock Workers, at the rates recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. At present the Watchmen are being paid at the rate of Rs. 6/- and the Head Watchmen at the rate of Rs. 7/- per head per shift. They are not paid any Dearness Allowance, City, Compensatory Allowance, House Rent Allowance or any other allowance admissible to other Dock Workers with whom they work side by side. They claim wages and other allowances with retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board as accepted by the Central Government by its resolution dated 28-3-1970. They submit that they should be paid wages on monthly scales on the basis of 30 days per month with a further direction that these workmen be treated as permanent employees of the companies. They want that the Head Watchmen and Gangway Watchmen should be paid Rs. 2/- per head per shift more than the ordinary watchmen as they have to discharge more onerous and responsible duties. They urge that one Head-watchmen should be employed on every ship, transit shed and godown. At present the watchmen are not being given any paid holidays. They demand that all the holidays declared by the Bombay Port Trust should be treated as holidays for them also. They further submit that at present they are not being paid any extra remuneration when they work on holidays. They claim wages at double the normal rates when they are made to work on holidays. At present the Watchmen are not being given any earned leave. They pray that earned leave for 30 days in a year may be given. They say that two sets of uniform per year that are now being supplied to them are not sufficient and that this number be raised to 4 sets, having regard to the fact that they work in sun and rain and come into contact with chemicals and explosives. They also say that the Watchmen should be supplied with one pair of shoes per year to look smarter in their uniform and also by way of protection for their feet. Along with the uniform they pray for payment of adequate monthly washing allowance. Lastly they say that leave travel concession at the end of every year should be given to them to enable them to see their folk in their far off villages.

The Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union filed a separate statement of claim on behalf of Watchmen working under the companies who are parties 1, 13 & 15 to this reference on the same lines as that filed by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union.

The Watchmen Contractors who are parties 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 to this reference and 3 other contractors have formed themselves on 9-8-1974 into an Association known as "Shin-Watchmen Contractors' Association". On their behalf the President of the Association filed a common statement dated 28-1-1975 contending that the Watchmen in question are not Dock Workers within the meaning of Act 9 of 1948 and therefore not entitled to the benefits the other Dock workers are entitled to under the Central Wage Board's recommendations. They further submit that the contractors cannot afford to bear the extra financial burden involved in the claim made by the workmen. They say that for every

four or more watchmen posted on Board the ship one Head Watchmen is engaged. According to them they are paying the extra remuneration of Re. 1/- to the Head Watchmen without obtaining any reimbursement from their principals. They submit that no Head Watchman is required to be employed if the number of watchmen posted on a ship is less than 4. They say that their financial position does not permit them to give earned leave and holidays to the Watchmen or pay them double the normal wages in case they are made to work on holidays. They further submit that the Watchmen are employed purely on a temporary basis. They are not permanent workers. Since their working days do not exceed 240 days in a year they cannot be given one month's leave with pay per year. They say that two sets of uniform that are now being supplied every year are sufficient. They submit that the demand for 4 sets of uniform and a pair of shoes is not justified.

On behalf of the Association a supplementary written statement was filed on 3-1-1976. In the supplementary statement the points raised in the earlier statement are only elaborated.

Party No. 15 M/s. Vinsons has filed a separate statement questioning the legality and maintainability of this reference. They also question the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to entertain this reference. Their stand is that since they do not employ any Watchmen on ships they cannot be considered to be necessary and proper party to this reference. They pray that their name may be debited from this reference.

On the above averments the points that arise for consideration are :—

1. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948 and if so whether they are entitled to the wages recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
2. If not whether this reference is liable to be rejected ?
3. Whether the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen are entitled to be paid salary on a monthly basis together with Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers ?
4. Whether the Head-watchmen and the Gangway Watchmen should be paid Rs. 2/- per shift more than the other Watchmen ?
5. Whether there should be a Head-watchmen on every ship, in a Transit Shed or in a Godown ?
6. Whether all Watchmen and Head-Watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared as holidays by the Bombay Port Trust for Dock Workers ?
7. Whether all Watchmen and Head-watchmen employed on holidays should be paid at double the normal rates of wages ?
8. Whether all the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given one month's leave with pay in a calendar year ?
9. Whether the Watchmen and Head-watchmen should be given four sets of uniform and one pair of shoes per year together with washing allowance ?
10. Whether all the Watchmen and Head-watchmen in question are entitled to annual leave travel concession ?
11. Whether the benefits if any of this adjudication should be given retrospective effect from 1-1-1969 or from the date of reference or any other date in between ?
12. To what relief ?

Point 1 :

The workmen involved in this dispute are Watchmen engaged by the Watchmen-contractors of Shipping Companies or their Agents. The Watchmen Contractors receive some

remuneration for every Watchmen they engage for their principals. From out of it, by the date of this reference, they were paying Rs. 6/- per head to each Watchmen and Rs. 7/- per head to each Head-Watchmen per shift. The balance they kept towards their remuneration. In this case the principals of these Contractors are not examined to prove the exact remuneration they are paying to their Watchmen Contractors for every Watchmen and Head-Watchmen engaged on their behalf. Upto June 1970 the Watchmen were being paid Rs. 2/- per head per shift. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union raised an industrial dispute with the employers for an upward revision of the wages of Watchmen and Headwatchmen vide Ex. E-4, Charter of demands dated 25-6-70. As per the settlement Ex. E-5 entered into between the parties before the Conciliation Officer on 30-7-1970 the remuneration of Watchmen was raised from Rs. 2/- to Rs. 6/- and that of Headwatchmen to Rs. 7/- per head per shift. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union issued the notice Ex. E-6 dated 2-3-1974 terminating that settlement. Ex. E-7, a fresh charter of demands was served on the companies giving rise to the present reference. The basis of the claim of the workmen as set out in the written statements of claim is that they are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948 and therefore covered by the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers as accepted by the Central Government. The companies contend that the Watchmen do not come within that definition of Dock Workers. Therefore the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers' cannot be extended to them. In this connection it is necessary to set out Section 2(b) of the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 9 of 1948 :—

"2(b)—'dock worker' means a person employed or to be employed in, or in the vicinity of, any port or work in connection with the loading, unloading movement or storage of cargoes, or work in connection with the preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port;"

It is to be seen whether the work of the Watchmen in question comes within the scope of the above definition. It is not in dispute that they are employed in the port or in its vicinity. The question in controversy is whether they are engaged in work in connection with loading unloading, movement, storage of cargo or work in connection with preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port. On this point there is the evidence of five witnesses for the employers and 3 witnesses for the employees.

EW-2 Shri K. A. Shaikh, Assistant Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union is practically a witness for the workmen. Shri Khimji Ranchodji, EW-3, Shri M. B. Nazereth EW-4 and Shri M. Moin Khan EW-5 speak on this question in support of the Employers' case.

EW-3 (Party No. 11) is the General Secretary of the Employers' Association consisting of parties 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 and M/s. Indian Surveyors Pvt. Ltd., which is a party to reference No. CGIT-2/4 of 1975 which is being disposed of along with this reference. He has given evidence not only for himself but on behalf of the other members of his Association. His is the case of an ordinary Watchman rising to the position of a Watchmen contractor. Having been a Watchmen himself and now a Watchmen Contractor his evidence on the points in dispute is entitled to great weight. According to him the Watchmen are engaged on board the ship and not at the Godowns. They are not posted to guard the cargo in the shed or in the Godown. Their sole duty is said to be to keep a watch over the cargo. They are engaged on Board the ship to keep a watch over the ship including all fittings like gear, wire-rope and cabins of the ship's officers. When the Stevedoring Gang board the vessel or disembark from the vessel they are searched and checked by the Watchmen. The Captain of the Ship orders the Watchmen to go to the Hatch to see that the cases of cargo are not broken open by the Stevedoring workmen. The Watchmen have nothing to do with the work of loading and unloading cargo. In his cross-examination he states that the Watchmen engaged by the

Port Trust do not watch the private property of the Exporters and Importers lying in the docks. He denies the suggestion that such property of private parties lying inside the Dock is watched by the Watchmen engaged by the Contractors. He further denies the suggestion that the Cargo of the principals if temporarily unloaded at Bombay Port should be watched by the Watchmen in question. He added that he never asked his watchmen to look after cargo temporarily unloaded by his principals but some other contractors who are also parties to this reference may take up such responsibility by engaging watchmen for that purpose. He further stated that one or two contractors who are parties to this dispute, might engage Watchmen to keep a watch over the Cargo lying in the Docks but he had never done so. He denies the suggestion that the contractors including himself engage watchmen on barges, when the ships unload their cargo thereon. He further stated that no contractor engages watchmen on country crafts, wharves, Bunders, Transit Sheds. There might be one or two exceptions to this usual practice. He admits that he engages watchmen to take care of the property lying outside the ship but inside the Dock.

EW-4, Shri M. B. Nazereth, (Party No. 3) aged about 26 years says that he has been doing this Contractors business since 1970. Besides this Contract business he is engaged in working as an Insurance Agent and teaching "effective public speaking" at the Indo-American Society. He engages watchmen only on board the ship and not outside the ship. The Watchmen are engaged to keep a watch over the ship and its cargo while inside the ship. They are not engaged in the work of loading or unloading the cargo. A very significant statement made by this witness is that the watchmen are 'supposed' to keep a watch on the cargo during the loading and unloading operation. They are not concerned with the movement of Cargo nor with the preparation of ships for sailing. In his cross-examination he was asked what he meant by saying that the watchmen are not concerned with the movement of cargo. He replied saying that because the watchmen do not physically handle the cargo he would say they were not engaged in the movement of cargo. He does not know what is meant by preparation of ship for sailing.

FW-5 Shri Moin Khan is party No. 14 to this dispute. He does not throw any light on the nature of work done by a Watchmen.

FW-2 Shri Shaikh is the Assistant Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union for the past 16 years. In his cross-examination he stated that the watchmen work in the vicinity of the Docks and Port in Bombay for watch and ward purpose, for the purpose of Import and Export of Cargo. According to him the Watchmen are Dock Workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948. This witness was examined on behalf the employers to prove the settlement of the earlier dispute, that arose in 1970 June between the workmen and the companies herein. The workmen taking advantage of the presence of this witness in the box elicited certain information favourable to them. The learned Counsel for the employers during the course of the re-examination of this witness, did not challenge the correctness of the statements made by him during his cross-examination.

WW-1 Shri Dastagir Abdul Majid is the watchman engaged by party No. 2 to this reference M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons, Bombay. He has been in their service for the past 16 years. He says that he works in the Docks, Ships, Sheds, Hay Bunder, Butcher Island and Launches. He says that he also works outside the Warehouses. He keeps a watch over the general cargo. He has to make a search of the crew members at the Gang-way. No cross examination is directed on this part of his evidence relating to the duties of the watchmen. In his cross-examination the witness stated that at times Supervisors of the Agent of the Vessel give instructions, to place watchmen on duty in the shed also.

WW-2, Mohamed Namkhan Salam Mohamed Sherif Khan has been working as Watchmen for the past 10 years under M/s. Subratikhan & Sons, party No. 13. He says that there are 65 Watchmen in that company along with him. They work on ships, barges, country crafts, Bunder, Butcher Island, Transit sheds, warehouses inside the docks. They are also

required to keep a watch on import and export cargo. They are required to work on sheds, in the gang-ways and also at hatches. In his cross-examination he stated that he watches the cargo both on the Steamer as well as inside the Godown.

WW-3 Shri Kalekhan claims to be Head-Watchman working with M/s. Vinsons Party No. 15. In his cross-examination he stated that when the ship is in the harbour he works on the ship and when the ship leaves the harbour he works in the godown. He also keeps a watch over the cargo lying in the docks.

On the above evidence it has to be seen if the Watchmen in question are employed in or in the vicinity of the port, in connection with the loading, unloading, movement or storage of cargoes, or work in connection with the preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port. The evidence of EWs. 3 and 4 clearly shows that the Watchmen are engaged to keep a watch over the cargo while it is being loaded or unloaded. The statement of EW-2 Shri Shaikh and that of WWs. 1 and 2 to this effect has not been seriously questioned. From the evidence of EW-3, the Secretary of the Employers' Association it appears that the workmen are also engaged to keep a watch over the cargo while it is lying in the dock. The Watchmen may not be actually handling the cargo themselves but their work is certainly connected with the loading and unloading operations of cargo because they have to keep a watch over those operations to prevent pilferage of the cargo. Relying on the above evidence I find that the watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act, 9 of 1948.

Even so Shri Jamadar for the companies submits that the workmen are not entitled to the pay scales recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. He invites attention to para. 6.24 of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers wherein it is stated that the Watchmen along with certain other categories are not covered by the recommendations made by them. The reason for excluding the five categories mentioned in that para. including the watchmen from the report was because of the objection raised by the employers and not because the members of the Board had any doubt on the question whether the Watchmen were Dock Workers within the meaning of Act, 9 of 1948, or no. Reference may be had to para. 7.2.94 (ibid) under the heading "Miscellaneous categories of dock workers" in which the Watchmen are included. At page 217 of that report, they recommended wage scales for the watchmen engaged by M/s. Union Lighterage company, Dharsi Moolji & Company, Bombay with a note "not dock workers, according to employer members". For the miscellaneous category of Dock workers wage scales are recommended on the same page and this includes the scales of pay for Watchmen and Head-watchmen. Even if the watchmen and Head-watchmen are excluded from the recommendations of the Wage Board on account of the objection raised by the employers still there is no reason why the benefit of the scales of pay recommended by the Wage Board after such extensive and deep study of the problems of the Dock Workers should not be extended to them.

Shri Jamadar further contends that the workmen must be deemed to have waived their right to claim the benefits of the recommendations of the Wage Board for the reason that they did not claim them at the appropriate time, viz. at the time of the earlier dispute in June, 1970. At page 226 of the Report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers the names of the members constituting the said Board are given. Shri S. R. Kulkarni was one of the members representing the workers. From EW-2, Shri Shaikh's evidence we get that Shri Kulkarni was the Secretary of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union and also the President of All India Port and Dock Workers' Federation. It is argued that since Shri Kulkarni representing the Dock workers did not press the claim of the Watchmen before the Wage Board no relief can be given by this Tribunal to these Watchmen on the basis of that report. The further argument advanced on behalf of the companies is that by 1970, June, on behalf of the Watchmen, the Transport and Dock Workers Union submitted a charter of demands Ex. F-4 and the dispute was settled between the parties amicably as per the settlement dated 30-7-1970 raising the wages of the Watchmen from Rs. 2 to Rs. 6 and that of the Head Watchman to Rs. 7 per shift. By the date of that settlement the report of the Central Wage Board was published in the Gazette and should have been within the knowledge of the Union. Further the Wage Board

recommended interim relief on 9-4-1965, which was accepted by the Central Government on 25-4-1965 and published in the Gazette of India, Part I, Section I on 15-5-1965. The Second interim relief recommended by the Wage Board was accepted by the Central Government vide Gazette of India, Part I, Section I dated 29th October, 1966 at page 714. It is argued that in spite of the fact that the Union was aware of the recommendations of the Wage Board by 30-7-1970 in regard to the watchmen still they did not press for payment of wages as per those recommendations. This conduct on the part of the Union is said to amount to waiver of the right available to the workmen under that report. I do not agree with this reasoning. It is submitted by Shri Wagh for the Union that in the year 1970 the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen were not members of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union. Therefore their claims could not have been effectively pressed before the Wage Board. It is further submitted that by the time the Wage Board was constituted the watchmen of M/s. Union Lighterage Company alone were members of their Union and their claims were pressed before the Board. The Wage Board also determined the Wage scales properly payable to these persons. He submitted that it is not correct to say that the workmen's representative abandoned the case of the Watchmen altogether. Regarding the other contention that the workmen should be deemed to have waived their right under the Wage Board's report on account of their conduct in June, 1970, Shri Wagh says that at that time the Watchmen's scale of pay were so low, that they had to take some quick action to obtain immediate relief. For that reason they did not press the benefit available to the watchmen under the Wage Board's recommendations. Even if the Union had by their inadvertence failed to claim the benefits due to the watchmen under the Wage Board's recommendations in the year 1970, still they cannot be now denied that benefit on that account. This plea of estoppel is certainly not available to the management in an industrial dispute.

For the aforesaid reasons point 1 is found against the employers and in favour of the workmen.

Point 2 :

In view of the finding recorded on point 1 this point has to be answered against the companies.

Point 3 :

Under point 1 it is found that the Watchmen and the Head Watchmen are dock workers within the meaning of Act, 9 of 1948 and though the Wage Board has specifically stated that their recommendations were not applicable to the Watchmen still the scales of pay recommended by the Wage Board for this category of workers should be usefully adopted. On behalf of the companies it is urged that these watchmen are casual workmen employed for about 5 to 7 days in a month. They say that there is no element of permanency in their service. During the period they are not on duty under the companies they are said to be free to work elsewhere, and therefore the question of payment of wages on monthly scale, holiday, earned leave and other benefits do not arise. The contention that the watchmen are only casual workers without any element of permanency is not supported by the evidence on record. WW-1, D. A. Majid stated that he has been working under party No. 2 to this dispute (M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons) for the past 16 years. He says that he gets employment under that company for 25 days in a month. If he has to absent himself from duty he has to obtain the previous permission of his employer. In his cross-examination his statement that he has been working for the past 16 years continuously under M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons has not been challenged. No witness on behalf of M/s. B. M. Nanabhoy & Sons has been examined to challenge the correctness of the statement made by him. In his cross-examination he further stated that if he had to apply for sick leave he should produce a medical certificate.

WW-2, Mohamed Naimkhan Salam Mohamed, Sherif Khan says that he has been working under M/s. Subratikhan & Sons party No. 13 to this dispute for the past 10 years. He says that for about 26 to 30 days in a month he gets employment under this company. Like WW-1 this witness also says that before going on leave he should submit an application for grant of leave in the prescribed form. In the case of this witness also his employer has not been examined to challenge the correctness of his statement. In his cross-exami-

nation the statement that he has been working for the past 10 years continuously for M/s. Subratikhan & Sons is not questioned. It is not even suggested to him that he could absent himself from duty as and when he pleased without having got to apply for leave.

WW-3, Shri Kalekhan says that he has been working as a watchman for the past 25 years with M/s. Vinsons (Party No. 15). In the cross-examination of this witness his claim that he has been working for M/s. Vinsons for the past 25 years has not been questioned though they say that this witness was never their employee but only their watchmen contractor.

EW-3, Shri Khimji Ranchodji, Secretary of the companies Association and also party to this dispute stated that no Watchman works for him for more than 4 years. According to him most of them do not care to work for more than one year. When he was asked as to why he was not giving earned leave, casual leave or sick leave to the watchmen he stated that he could not afford to give such facilities. It is not his case that because the watchmen were casual employees such benefits were not extended to them. He admits that he pays bonus to his Watchmen.

EW-4, Mr. M. B. Nazereth, stated that the 4 watchmen he is now employing have been with him in this business from the days of his grandfather. This will give an idea of the permanency of service of these Watchmen.

EW-5, Moin Khan stated that his 3 Watchmen have been working with him since 1972.

On the above evidence the case of the employers that the work of these watchmen is of a highly casual nature cannot be accepted. The 3 most prosperous employers according to EW-3 viz., M/s. Menlyn & Co., M/s. Subratikhan & Sons and M/s. B. M. Nenabhoy & Sons (Parties to this dispute) did not care to lead any evidence on their behalf.

Regarding the number of days each watchman gets employment, there is the evidence of EWs-3 and 4 and that of the workmen WWs-1 and 2. EW-3 has stated that the Watchmen work in 3 shifts daily and that each watchman gets work for 25 shifts per month. The number of shifts each watchman works is indicated in the Muster-roll Ex. E-8 produced by him. The Muster-roll for January, 1974 shows that no watchmen of his had worked for more than one shift on any given day. It further shows that 5 out of the 16 watchmen got employment for 25 shifts at the rate of one shift per day for the month of January, 1974 and 8 Watchmen work for 20 shifts or more per month at the rate of one shift per day.

EW-4, Mr. M. B. Nazereth, stated that each Watchman gets work for 25 to 30 shifts in a month. He has not produced his Attendance Register to show if the number of shifts is calculated at the rate of one shift per day or otherwise.

On the side of the workmen WWs. 1 and 2 have stated that they get employment for 25 to 30 days in month and there is no cross-examination of these witnesses on that point. As already stated the most prosperous 3 concerns in this line of business have not chosen to lead any evidence on this point.

On the above evidence it has to be held that the Watchmen get employment for 25 to 30 days in a month on an average every month. This also indicates that the work of the Watchmen is not of a casual nature as contended by the companies.

It is to be next considered under this issue to what pay, Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance are the workmen entitled? As already stated the scales of pay recommended by the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers for Watchmen and Head-watchmen can be usefully adopted and on that basis the Watchmen be paid salaries on a monthly basis instead of at a daily rate. The Central Wage Board at page 217 of its report recommended a scale of Rs. 100-2-130 for the Watchmen and at page 218 the scale of Rs. 115-3-136-4-160 in the case of Head-Watchmen (for Head-Watchmen in Bombay). On this salary they should get Dearness Allowance, House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance, at the rates recommended by the said Wage Board. Shri Wagh and Shri Shetty for the workmen urged that if the scales recommended by the Central Wage Board in its report of the year 1969 are to be accepted and given effect to in

this award retrospective effect should be given to this award from 1-1-1969 or at least from the date of this reference viz. 26-12-1974. Shri Jamadar for the Companies requests that retrospective effect may not be given to this Award for the reason that it will be very difficult for the companies to claim reimbursement from their principals for the excess amount payable. It is then argued on behalf of the workmen that the pay of the Watchmen and the Head Watchmen may be fixed as per the recommendations of the Wage Board of the year 1969 as modified by the Wage Revision Committee. The stand taken by the Unions on behalf of the workmen appears to be reasonable. I therefore hold that the Watchmen and the Head Watchmen should be given wages in the scale of Rs. 100-2-130 and the Rs. 115-3-136-4-160 per month respectively besides other allowances as recommended by the Central Wage Board and as subsequently modified by the Wage Revision Committee.

Shri Jamadar for the employers submits that the companies will not be in a position to bear this extra financial burden. It is argued on behalf of the workmen that the companies herein are mere contractors and they do not pay the wages of these Watchmen from out of their pocket. They collect some amount per each Watchman and Headwatchman from the Shipping Companies or their agents and pay something less than the amount collected to the workmen keeping the balance towards their commission. When each Watchman was paid Rs. 2 till June, 1970 according to EW-3 the principals were paying a sum of Rs. 3 per Watchman. When in terms of the Settlement Ex. E-5 dated 30-7-1970 the wages of watchmen were enhanced to Rs. 6 and that of the Head watchmen to Rs. 7 EW-3 says that the companies began to collect Rs. 10 per Watchman and Head-watchman retaining the balance towards their commission. It is argued for the workmen that if this Tribunal further enhances the wage scale of these workmen shipping companies or their agents who are quite capable of bearing the extra burden will certainly raise the amount they are paying to the companies herein. There is considerable force in this argument advanced on behalf of the workmen. It may also be seen that the 3 or 5 of the most prosperous companies in this line of business who are parties to this dispute did not care to lead evidence in support of their plea that they cannot bear the extra financial burden. From this attitude of theirs also, it may be inferred that they have the necessary capacity to pay the enhanced wages. The smallest of the companies like those of EWs. 3 to 5 have come forward to plead their inability. If the smaller contractors are unable to bear the extra burden they may have to close down their business. The Wage scales that are recommended for the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen by the Central Wage Board are the minimum wages, which any employer has to pay. As submitted by Shri Wagh the Shipping Companies and their Agents will certainly raise this amount payable for these Watchmen to enable the companies to bear the extra financial burden and at the same time help them keep a margin for themselves. No witness from the Shipping Companies or their Agents has been examined to say that if the remuneration of the Watchmen and Head-watchmen is to be raised they will not pay the extra amount to their contractors. The apprehension of the witnesses EWs 3 to 5 that in the event of the wage scales of the workmen in question are to be raised they may have to wind up their business appears to be more imaginary than real. The above scales of pay fixed for Watchmen and Headwatchmen do not include Stream allowance and such other allowances as are usually paid besides their regular wages.

Point 3 answered accordingly for the workmen.

Point 4 :

Admittedly the Head-watchmen receives Re. 1 more than the ordinary Watchman. In the statement of claim the Head-watchman claim Rs. 2 per head per shift instead of the existing rate of Re. 1. As higher scale of pay is fixed for the Head-watchman this question of payment of extra remuneration to him for every shift does not arise.

Point 4 answered accordingly.

Point 5 :

In their statement of claim it is stated that at least one Head-watchman should be employed on every ship, in transit shed and in Godown. They say that not all the companies

are engaging Head-watchmen. They say that they have raised this demand to regularise the practice of engaging Head-watchmen and compel the employers who are not now engaging a Head-watchmen to fall in line. The companies in their statement stated that this demand for engaging a Head-watchman on every ship cannot be acceded to since their employment is not in their hands but in the hands of the principals.

EW-3 Shri Khimji Ranchodji has stated that for every 4 Watchmen engaged on a ship there will be one Head-watchmen. He further stated that the Maximum number of watchmen that may be engaged on a ship is 3 and the minimum is one. EW-4 does not speak about the aspect of the case nor EW-5. On behalf of the workmen WWs. 1 and 2 did not speak to the practice that is now prevailing regarding the engagement of Head-watchmen. In the circumstances the evidence of EW-3 has to be accepted. On the basis of that I hold that for every 4 Watchmen one Head-watchman should be engaged.

Point 5 found accordingly.

Point 6 :

In the statement of claim of the workmen it is stated that all the Watchmen and the Head-watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all days declared by the Bombay Port Trust as holidays for Dock workers. They say that at present the Watchmen and the Head-Watchmen are not entitled to claim wages for these holidays while all other dock workers enjoy this facility. The companies in their written statement say that since the employment of the watchmen is of a casual nature the grant of paid holidays to them does not arise. During the discussion on point 3 it is held that the Watchmen are not engaged on casual basis, but on a fairly permanent basis. So this contention of the companies in their written statement that the employment of Watchmen is essentially of a casual nature and therefore the question of grant of paid holidays to them does not arise cannot be accepted. In the course of his evidence EW3 the Secretary of the Companies Association has stated that the companies do not give their Watchmen the facilities of earned leave, sick leave or casual leave because they cannot afford to do so. The other employers' witnesses have not adverted to this matter in the course of their evidence. On behalf of the workers it is argued that justice requires that the Watchmen should be given paid holidays on the same footing as other persons working in the Docks. They say that the conditions of service of all the Dock Workers working side by side should be the same. It is represented that at present in every year 13 holidays besides Sundays are declared by the Bombay Port Trust for their employees. I see no reason why the same benefit of paid holidays should not be extended to the workmen in question also.

Point 6 accordingly answered for the workmen.

Point 7 :

The Unions on behalf of the Watchmen say that if any Watchman is employed on any holiday he should be paid double the normal wages. The ships that come to the harbour for loading or unloading operations have to be attended to without any delay. It follows that men have to work on all days, whether they be working days or holidays. It is said that the Bombay Port Trust declares 13 days in a year as paid holidays for its workmen, besides all Sundays. The question is whether the Watchmen should be paid double the normal wages on all the holidays, if there is work to do. So far as Sundays (i.e. weekly rest day) are concerned it is but fair that the Watchmen should be paid double the wages, if they have to forego their weekly rest day. Similarly the first of May which is said to be one of the 13 days declared as holidays for the Dock workers, the workmen herein would like to participate in the workers' Rallies, conducted by the Trade Unions. If the Watchmen are called upon to work on that day they should be paid double the normal wages. The same thing holds good with regard to the Independence day and Republic day (15-8 and 26-1 of every year respectively). It has to be seen if the Watchmen should be paid double the wages on the other dock holidays, if they are called upon to work on those days. For instance, it is not necessary that a Hindu or a Muslim should observe Christmas or that a Christian or a Muslim should observe Dassera or Dipawali.

I feel that only when a Watchman is asked to work on a holiday, which happens to be a day of festival or has some significance according to his religious persuasion should he be entitled to payment of double the normal wages.

I therefore find on point 7 that work if taken on Sundays, Independence day, Republic Day and May day (i.e. First of May) should be paid at double the normal rate of wages. If work is taken on days which are declared as festival holidays wages should be paid at double the normal wages on a Sectional basis.

Point 8 :

The workmen demand one month's earned leave for every year of service. The companies say that they cannot afford to meet this commitment. Till now the Watchmen are not being given any leave whatsoever, not even casual leave or sick leave. The demand for grant of earned leave appears to be justified. The workers have not asked for casual leave or sick leave separately. Shri Jamadar for the companies submits that out of this 30 days earned leave asked for, a portion of it may be given as casual leave, another portion as sick leave and the balance as earned leave. I feel that casual leave of 5 days, and sick leave of 4 days in a year may be granted. So far as sick leave is concerned it can be accumulated indefinitely. The casual leave if not availed of in a year, will lapse at the conclusion of that year. The balance of 21 days may be called earned leave. It can be accumulated upto 3 years.

Point 8 found accordingly.

Point 9 :

At present the Watchmen are being supplied 2 sets of uniform consisting of a pair of trousers and a bush shirt with half-sleeves. No foot-wear is supplied along with the uniform. While the Watchmen say that 2 sets of uniform will not last through the year, the employers say that they are quite sufficient. The Watchmen say that a pair of leather shoes should be supplied to them every year to add to their smartness and also give protection to their feet as they have to watch loading and unloading of chemicals and explosives. I feel that a pair of leather shoes should form part of the uniform and it should be supplied by the employers. I further hold that 2 pairs of uniform per year should suffice. If they are carefully worn only while on duty.

The Watchmen claim washing allowance for their uniforms. On behalf of the companies it is argued that since this washing allowance does not find a place in the Charter of demands Ex F-7 the workmen are not entitled to this relief. This claim also does not form part of the points of dispute referred to this Tribunal, under the reference in question. It is sought to be argued on behalf of the workmen that washing allowance comes under the head of provision of uniform and therefore it is open to this Tribunal to consider that question also. I do not agree.

On point 9 I find that there is no need to supply more than 2 sets of uniform per year. I further find that along with the uniform a pair of leather shoes should be supplied to the Watchmen, every year. The claim for washing allowance is rejected.

Point 10 :

On behalf of the Watchmen it is said that the Watchmen come from different regions of the country and unless the employer help them they cannot afford to go periodically to their villages to see their kith and kin or to keen themselves in touch with the village. It is said that a change of environment once a year, will refresh a workman and also improve his general standard of health. It is also said that since leave travel concession is not asked for, their entire family but only for the individual workman, the demand may be considered favourably. On behalf of the employers it is submitted that they cannot afford to pay for this amenity. I feel that leave Travel Concession to each individual employee (and not for his entire family) may be granted once in three years.

Point 10 found accordingly.

Point 11 :

This aspect of the case is already dealt with under point 3. As the companies express their inability to pay the revised rates of wages with retrospective effect, this prayer of the

Watchmen is not granted. To compensate the workmen for the loss suffered by them on this account, they are being given wages at a scale higher than they have actually claimed. In the statement of claim, the Watchmen prayed for grant of wages at the rates recommended by the Central Wage Board in its report of the year 1969. After the date of reference, the recommendations of the Wage Revision Committee have been accepted by the Central Government as a result of which higher scales of pay are being paid to the dock workers. Shri Shetye and Shri Wagh have urged that the benefit of the higher wage scale may be given to the workmen herein. I agree. The benefit of this award should be given from 15-8-1977.

Point 11 found accordingly.

Before concluding one more matter remains to be considered. Party No. 15 (M/s Vinsons) filed a written statement stating that they do not employ any Watchmen on ships and therefore are improperly impleaded as a party to this reference. Shri Shetye for the workmen disputes the truth of this contention. Kalekhan (WW-3) says that he has been working as a Watchman and Head-watchmen under M/s. Vinsons for the past 25 years. In support of that he has filed 2 brass buckles issued by M/s Vinsons (Ex. W-18 and W-19), bearing the following legend :

"VINSONS

Ex. W-18

Stevedores Dubashes & Contractors Clearing Shipping & Travel Agents WATCHMEN No. 1950

"VINSONS

Ex. W-19

Stevedores Dubashes & Contractors Clearing Shipping & Travel Agents KALEKHAN HEAD WATCHMEN No. 1".

EW-1 Shri Vazirani, one of the partners of M/s Vinsons admits having issued the buckle Ex. W-18 bearing No. 150 and not the other Ex. W-19. The Buckle Ex. W-18 probabilises the contention of WW-3. I have believe WW-3 when he says that the buckle W-19 was also issued by M/s Vinsons. In the certificates issued by M/s Vinsons Exs. W-2 to W-4, WW-3 is described as their Watchmen Exs. W-14 to W-16 are letters addressed by M/s Vinsons to the Inspector of Police, Yellow Gate Police Station requesting him to issue temporary passed to their Watchmen. On behalf of M/s Vinsons, Ex. E-9 consisting of 11 receipts passed in their favour is filed for the purpose of showing that they were not engaging any Watchmen. These receipts significantly come into existence after this dispute is referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Exhibits E-9 (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7) and (10) are the receipts passed by WW-3 in favour of M/s Vinsons. The receipts show the amount received by WW-3 for the Watchmen engaged. In each of these the number of Watchmen and Head Watchmen engaged is given. On the basis of these receipts it is sought to be argued that WW-3 is a Watchmen Contractor of M/s Vinsons. Admittedly (EW-1 admits) M/s. Vinsons are Watchmen Contractors. Why they should engage another such contractor is not clear. Again the receipts Ex. E-9 series show the payment of Rs. 7/-per shift to Head Watchmen and Rs. 6/-per shift to the ordinary Watchmen, which are the actual prevailing rates of wages for this category of workmen by the respective dates on which the above receipts were passed. If WW-3 was a Contractor, in his own right one would expect him to collect something over and above the actual wages towards his commission. Ex-1 or his representative does not say anything on this aspect. Further admittedly the entire amount on account of Watchmen is collected by M/s Vinsons from their principals and only the actual wages are paid to this Watchman. The balance is obviously being retained by M/s Vinsons.

For the aforesaid reasons I hold that M/s Vinsons are Watchmen Contractors and WW-3 is the 'Head Watchman' in their employ.

Point 12 :

In the result the points referred to this Tribunal for adjudication are answered as below :—

1 (a) The Watermen and the Head-watchmen should be paid wages, Dearness Allowance, House Rent 89 GI/77—12.

Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance per the recommendations of the Central Board for Port and Dock Workers (vide page and 218 of the Report of the Central Board for Port and Dock Workers) as liberalised the Wage Revision Committee. In the case of sons who are already in service, they should be given weightage at the rate of one increment for every years of completed service. This is without prejudice to the claim of stream allowance and such allowances, the Watchmen are entitled to at present besides pay.

(b) Since the Head Watchmen are being given a high scale of pay, the question of payment of Rs. 2/- per shift to them does not arise.

(c) For every 4 Watchmen, one Head Watchmen should be employed on every ship, transit shed and in godown.

2 (a) All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given holidays with pay on all declared as holiday by the Bombay Port Trust for the Workers.

(b) The Watchmen and Head Watchmen employed on all Sundays, on Independence Day, Republic Day and May day should be paid double the normal rates of wages. In the case of other days declared as holidays on the basis of religion, according to the religious persuasion of each Watchman or Head Watchman double the normal wages should be paid, if they are called upon to work on those days.

3. All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given 5 days casual leave during every calendar year on full pay which cannot be accumulated.

4 days on full pay in a year as sick leave which can be accumulated indefinitely.

21 days of earned leave which can be accumulated upto three years.

4. All Watchmen and Head Watchmen should be given every year 2 sets of uniform consisting of one pair of trousers and one half-sleeved bush shirt and one pair of leather shoes.

5. All the Watchmen and Head Watchmen (and not their families) should be paid once in every 3 years an amount equal to the bus or II class Railway fare for travel between Bombay and their respective native places and back.

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

[No L-31011(10)/74-P&D/CMT/D.IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1977

क्र. आ. 3257.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1961 का 22) की धारा 13 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (6) तथा धारा 8 के अधीन विनिर्दिष्ट नियमों के संबंध में उसके द्वारा प्रयोज्य शक्तियां निरीक्षण तथा क्वालिटी नियंत्रण निदेशक द्वारा भी प्रयोज्य होंगी।

[क्र. सं. 1(3)/76-नि. नि. तथा नि. उ.]

क्र. वी. बालासुब्रह्मण्यम, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 15th October, 1977

S. 3257.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sec-13 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby directs the powers exercisable by it in relation to the specified under sub-section (6) of Section 7, and Section 8 of the said Act shall be exercisable also by the Director of Inspection and Quality Control.

[File No. 1(3)/76-EI&EP]

K. V. BALASUBRAMANIAM, Dy. Director

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(विद्युत् विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1977

का. आ. 3258.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी गव है कि यशपाल, अवर श्रेणी लिपिक, विद्युत् विभाग से संबंधित भागीय जांच के प्रयोजनों के लिए एक साक्षी के रूप में श्री जी. के. डोगरा को समन करना आवश्यक है,

अतः, अब, विभागीय जांच (माक्षियों को हाजिर कराना तथा इस्तार्ज पेश कराना) अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 18) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री के. के. मेहरा, अवर सचिव, विद्युत् विभाग को, जो कि उक्त विभागीय जांच के संबंध में जांच अधिकारी का काम कर रहे हैं, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 में निर्दिष्ट शक्तियों का प्रयोग श्री जी. के. डोगरा के संबंध में करने का प्राधिकार देती है।

भारत के राजपत्र के भाग दो, खंड-3 उप खंड (11), दिनांक 10 सितम्बर, 1977 में प्रकाशित ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (विद्युत् विभाग) का का. आ. सं. 2822 दिनांक 20 अगस्त, 1977 एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[सं. 6/8/75-वत्त.]

अरुण भटनागर, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Power)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1977

S.O. 3258.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that for the purposes of the departmental inquiry in relation to Shri Yash Pal, Lower Division Clerk, Department of Power, it is necessary to summon as a witness Shri G. K. Dogra;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Departmental Inquiries (Enforcement of Attendance of Witnesses and Production of Documents) Act, 1972 (18 of 1972), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri K. K. Mehra, Under Secretary, Department of Power, acting as the inquiring authority in respect of the aforesaid departmental enquiry to exercise the power specified in section 5 of the said Act in relation to Shri G. K. Dogra.

S.O. No. 2822 dated 20th August, 1977 from the Ministry of Energy, (Department of Power) published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated 10th September, 1977 is hereby cancelled.

[No. 6/8/75-VIG]

ARUN BHATNAGAR, Dy. Secy.